SIDE LIGHTS

ON

WESTERN CIVILIZATION

BY

K. C. SEN,

AUTHOR OF "THE GITA AND THE CASTES."



PUBLISHED BY

THE DESHABANDHU PUBLISHING Co., Ltd.

74, DHARAMTALA STREET, CALCUTTA.

1931

Price Rs. 3

Printed at the Usha Press.
74, Dharamtala Street, Calcutta.

PREFACE

I am an old man now, and have been one for a number of years. I have spent the most important part of my life in the public service to which I am deeply grateful for the small pension which it eventually placed at my disposal, thereby relieving me of some of the most harrowing worries of life. Western Civilization is open to criticism in many ways: it is cruel and conspicuously exploitive in principle and practice. But the idea which underlies the charity to superannuated helplessness is a marvellous feature in its pregmatic corporate mentality. The public service is not a bed of roses, and I believe nature did not intend me for it, when bringing me into existence. However after spending more than three decades without experiencing any catastrophic disaster, I beleive I never felt more happy than on the day on which I received the Permanent Pay Order from the Accountant General. This order has enabled me to live a quiet, lonely life in a remote corner of Bengal, away from the noissome activities of city life, and to devote myself to the study of the problem of human life. The outcome of that study is the book which I offer to the reading public in the hope that it may help them to discover why men live, and what makes life worth living and not merely to inquire how to live it.

Two of the Esays, *viz.*, "the Dictator of the Microcosm" and "The Dismal Devil's Glare in the Dark" were written in 1923-24 and published in the 'Hindusthan Review' to whose Editor my acknowledgements are due for permitting me to reprint them.

My obligations are also due to Mr. J. C. Banerjee who helped me in my studies in my helpless old age by selecting books suitable to my taste and temperament.

Lastly, my deepest obligations are due to Mr. and Mrs. J. C. Gupta who kindly encouraged me when I asked for advice as to how

I could get the book printed at Calcutta, a place for which I had no youthful predilection, and where I never before intended to come except for consulting an optician or for providing myself with petty civilised necessities and conveniences of life, or to stay for more than a week at a time. The Guptas kindly set apart excellent accommodation for me in their completely equipped, splendid suburban residence, and looked after my health and comfort with true filial affection for about six months. I admire them particularly because Western Civilization is teaching our youth to appraise everything, old age not excepted, more by its potential, than by its past or present value.

K. C. SEN,

CALCUTTA,
Dated, the 25th April, 1931.

CONTENTS.

Foreword 1
Culture and Civilization 2
The Name 2
The Natural Basis of Civilization 4
The Cultural Basis of Civilization 9
Behaviour Towards One's Self 11
Behaviour Towards Neighbour 15
The Empire of Property 22
The Empire of Masculinity 51
The Empire of Divinity 97
The Empire of Raciality 179
The Dictator of the Mecrocosm 232
The Dismal Devil's Glare in the Dark 251
The Tragedy of Trade Depression 399

FOREWORD

SIXTY years ago when, at the age of ten, I found the words "The Dark Age" repeated over several pages in succession of my history book, I thought that they related to the time when God had not yet uttered the majestic, ever memorable, words "Let there be light." During these sixty years I have seen much, and read and reflected a little, and I am convinced that the response to this peremptory command, addressed to anonymous workers, though promptly made, was very imperfect in substance and deceitful in character. Twilight, not true light, was what they presented to God. It was in twilight that God created man. It is in twilight that man is ever searching for truth. It is probable also that through undeniable ignorance our innocent primal progenitors neglected the sweetest and the most nourishing parts of the apple, "whose taste brought death into the world and all human woes."

Man has done much to make the light a little brighter, but he still carries on life, after five thousand years of struggle and suffering, in nightlight, practising his racial profession like rats and musk rats which show their mischievous activities in the dark, filling the world with wreckage and stench, and leaving very little undisturbed which makes life worth living.

It is marvellous to contemplate the extreme disproportion between life and light, a disproportion which has been augmented, developed and intensified by western civilization a thousand times more rapidly and effectively than by any previous civilization. There is hurry and bustle, jostling and elbowing, knocking and shocking, incessantly going on on all sides, on land and sea, in the east and west, in the air and underground. The earth has been disembowelled, and its surface has been covered with running streams and rushing engines, which fertilize the land, and carry the produce to the door of the consumer, unmindful of the malaria

which afterwards causes depopulation. In the open spaces sky-scrapers and smoking chimneys are trying to transcend the limitations of height and flight. Surface clay and sub-surface lime and stone ; wood, coal and iron ; cotton, cocoon and fleece ; sheep skin and lizard skin, and hides of various sorts ; the turning forces of gravitation and torsion ; the power of heat and light ; of electricity and magnetism ; chemical force and vital energy ; human nerves and muscles ; intelligence and passions ; wills and impulses have been manipulated for the satisfaction of human desires, for gratifying human pride and vanity, for increasing human wealth and longevity, for diffusing welfare and culture, and for making life worth living.

It has largely succeeded with the other purposes, but not in the last purpose. It has altogether failed to make life worth living for the vast majority of mankind, while its success in regard to a small fraction of the species is highly problematical. It may be argued that the evidence derived from the statistics of suicide does not lend a strong support to this gloomy view of western civilization. But those who thus argue take no account of the most unforgettable fact that homicide, acting as a substitute for suicide, reduces the latter to a comparatively insignificant phenomenon in western civilization. Uncivilized races have been extinguished within recent centuries for the benefit of the civilized races, and among the civilized races themselves war and starvation, infant massacres by blockade and low wages, expropriations and exploitations, jealousy and competition have caused more havoc than plague and pestilence ever did in less civilized times. All this has been done and continue to be done with a scientifically trained conscience and vivid consciousness. There is nothing so immoral or mean, so destructive or shocking that it can deter civilized man from action when it promises the reward of progress to civilization. The idea of progress though obscure includes destruction as one of its vital elements. Western civilization is literally built upon skulls, and it wears a gorgeous garland of human heads ; for modern ethics have broadened the idea of morality by including within its scope and meaning all that conduces to social progress and advancement of civilization The individual has lost his power, his dignity, his value, all of which have now been usurped by group-life, by

nationalism, capitalism, socialism, masculinism, feminism, industrialism, trades unionism, and other practical and frightful manifestations of abstract group-life. The individual has no separate salvation to aspire to. The salvation of the group-life magically includes his own salvation. The inquisition used to send groups of heretics to hell at one stroke. Western civilization will send groups of nationalists, capitalists, socialists and feminists to heaven in mass formation and phalanx.

About twenty five years ago my feelings regarding the psychology of western civilization were deeply shaken by the South African war and the Russo-Japanese war, and the evident purposes that lay beneath the psychology of the dominant belligerents, together with the secret chucklings that stirred the minds of neutral nations, showing that the heart of the entire west seethed with homicidal passions, tingled by past memories or future anticipations, and checked only by self-interests. These facts showed to what depths nationalism and patriotism had descended, what meanness it had fostered, what deceitfulness buoyed it up. It appeared to me that all that men regarded as creative work in western civilization was at bottom potentially destructive. The Great War, not long after, showed that the potentiality was not a weak remote possibility, but one that was already half realized by the end of 1918. The subsequent peace effected by the famous treaty of Versailles, which according to Nitti, made a desert and called it peace, showed that the destructive psychology of western civilization, so far only suspected, was a reality of tremendous significance. Every man was a nationalist first, an internationalist or a humanist next. Every man was a nationalist first, and a capitalist or a socialist, a masculinist or a feminist next. Every man was a nationalist first, and a churchman or infidel next. Nationalism means war and costly preparations for war; war means destruction, and the last war means final destruction of civilization, and the return to the primitive war of one against each and all, with the uncertain Hobbeseian prospect of a new experiment in social organization. About half a century ago Huxley anticipated such an experiment, necessitated by the relations between capital and labour. That problem has not been settled yet

The problem of nationalism, leadership and ascendancy has in the meanwhile come conspicuously to the front, and is marching on with stately strides despite national league, self-determination, racial freedom and other bombastic diplomatic camouflage.

This criticism led me to think of the history of western civilization and of the changes it had undergone in the course of the last two thousand years, and to compare it with other civilizations, now dead or decaying, and to study them in their various aspects, religious, moral, intellectual and emotional, and it occurred to me that human psychology is more independent of time and space than we suspect though its manifestations are different at different times for the same civilization, and different in different places at the same time for different civilizations. The psychology is the same at bottom all over the world. The interplay of the subjective and the common objective world affects humanity on the same principle everywhere, and at all times, but it affects it at bottom to a much smaller extent than we commonly suppose. The apparent differences, which loom so large, are created and developed by differences in periphery, circumstance, environment and other names. It is important to bear in mind that a difference once started goes on developing in mass and strength, until it becomes more conspicuous than the likenesses, though the latter are more vital.

Further reflexion brought to my memory an old story of a British graduate who, after spending more than half his life in the Civil Service in India, visited his Alma Mater, impelled by curiosity to see how she had changed since his time. He passed through the rooms of the hostel, and found in a bath room fastened from outside, a young woman, who was very hesitatingly introduced, by way of explanation, by a student, as a country-cousin. At this the old man smiled and mumbled, "the same play ground, the same common room, the same living rooms, the same bath room, and the same country cousin !" But certainly there were changes in all directions. The old furniture, the old text books, the old professors and the old students were all replaced by fresh ones, but the adolescent psychology which made the visit of the country-cousin possible was unchanged.

It also seemed to me that civilizations, old and new, eastern and western have a common psychology with somewhat minor divergences. They are like "The colonel's lady and judy O'Grady, sisters under their skins." Strange as it may seem the couplet occurs in the writings of Mr. Kipling, who was a conspicuous figure in the world of literature, and famous for the lines academically frivolous, politically pregnant,

"East is east, west is west,
The twain can never meet."

Rabindra Nath Tagore made a slight correction and substituted 'wed' for 'meet'. The correction seems like the one of which readers of O. W. Holmes' "Autocrat at the Breakfast Table" are aware, and which cannot be reproduced here on account of its length. The principles of wedlock and divorce have been changed by feminism, and it is difficult to see whether Dr. Tagore had the old or the new principles in mind. The text of his writings on the subject leads one to think that a tentative connection on the new principles may be beneficial to the east. He seems to forget, however, that Japan entered into such connection, and gradually drifted into cultural subjection and uniformity. At present she looks splendid, but the time may soon come when she will begin to repent. India and China cannot have brighter prospects if they change their psychology to bring it into line with the west Western civilization is itself uneasy in the head. Its intellectual vigour is growing, but its moral propensities and perversities are showing tremendous reactions. Socialism and feminism are alien to the foundational principles of western civilization, but they are marching forward fearlessly, while she looks on these destructive movements with a sense of helplessness, if not with positive complaissance based on the idea that they are natural developments of her constitution, not external forces of disorder and dislocation, disorganization and disruption. They are supposed to be not parasites or pathogenetics, but tonic and nervigorative.

My own opinion regarding the relations, actual and potential of eastern and western civilization agrees with what is said in 'Wise

Wedlock' by Dr. Beale, who, with reference to the couplet already quoted from Rudyard Kipling, *viz.*,

> "The colonel's lady and judy O'Grady
> Are sisters under their skins,"

remarks with great wisdom, that it would be a mistake for a young subaltern fresh from Sandhurst to marry Miss O'Grady and to present her to the Colonel's lady, his mother, on the strength of that universal subcutaneous sisterhood. If the world had a personality of her own, the wisest thing for humanity would have been to keep the two civilizations apart, if possible, and to allow them to develop, each by itself. But they have already met in love and strife, and penetrated into each other so profoundly and so inevitably that it is fatuous to think of separating them and of restoring them to their former purity. It may seem strange; but the truth is that western civilization, the psychology of the cosmic life of prehistoric times, has been contaminated and corrupted by christianity, which is an eastern idea, an essential part of the eastern principles of life. At the same time it is remarkable that the atmosphere of western civilization has given a western orientation to christianity similar to what the atmosphere of Eastern Bengal imparts to the mango graft brought from Maldah. Both christianity and western civilization have lost their primal purity and peculiarity. It is however true that western civilization has of late been shaking off the wasting, emaciating, debilitating influences of christianity, and resuming its pre-christian vigour, though somewhat tardily. Nietzsche has with inimitable efficiency dealt with the influence of christianity upon western civilization, with an unparalleled combination of scientific and artistic effect. In the east western civilization is vigourously at work with the purpose of supplanting the best elements of eastern psychology, and producing a noxious mixture which threatens to turn Asia into a huge continent of comfort-loving helplessness. The relations between the east and the west are now inextricably complicated to the point of transcending human control. The worst of it is that western psychology in its baser, but attractive parts has taken hold of the eastern mind, and neither platform nor press activities of pugnacious culture can winnow them out, while the higher elements of that psychology remain too high for imitation, to say nothing of assimilation.

Western and eastern civilizations have developed in such different environments for such a long period of time that in their external manifestations at least they look like having been conceived in two different species of ovary. Eastern civilization has grown up in sunshine, softsoil, pleasant breeze, and fairly temperate heat. Western civilization on the other hand has developed in such disagreeable climate ; hard and stony soil that it almost seems that God had designed them for the children of Cain, the first deliberately recalcitrant spirit in humanity, who is aptly supposed by the splendid antiquarian imagination of Mr. Shaw to have preferred the predative to the productive mode of life, to evade divine curse.

Scientifically speaking the two civilizations may be more appropriately distinguished as the civilization of cold and cloud, and the civilization of warmth and colour respectively. It is obvious, the first stages in the first civilization were hard and tardy, from the comparatively barbarous condition in which the German and other nordic races were found by the conquering Romans, by Tacitus and other philosophers at a time when two splendid civilizations were at their height in the neighbourhood, to say nothing of the civilizations which were thriving in the east.

Left to themselves these untouchable races were developing their own psychology and civilization, their own forms of social organization, their own modes of love and strife, when christanity in the name of a higher civilization obtruded itself to give it a turn in an alien direction, from the cosmic to the ethical process of growth, from natural to circumstantial, sophisticated selection. Christianity tried in short to superimpose an exotic civilization upon the barbaric native variety. It failed in the long run, but it succeeded in retarding the growth of the latter civilization for more than a thousand years. Even after that the noxious influence of christianity was heavily felt, for though it had made no deep impression upon its structure, its pinpricks injected poison into the subcutaneous regions in fragmentary forms. Fortunately western civilization in its reaction upon christianity gave it a new orientation so as to reduce its pernicious power of easternising the west.

For some centuries western civilization and christianity were so confusedly mixed up as to turn them virtually into one civilization, a unity in duality, a sort of patched up religion based upon the

official shape, which was very different from the Christanity left by Peter and Paul. These personages now live in brick and mortar turned into cathedrals : they do not live in the hearts of the people who call themselves christians. The spiritual brick and mortar which Christ had accumulated, and architecturally organized into a religion are now in ruins, dilapidated, denuded, crumpled, crumbled and encrusted all over with the filth of infidelism of various colours, namely, of agnosticism, atheism, naturalism, rationalism, humanism and so forth.

The character of the mixture in the middle ages is strikingly illustrated by the persecutions of the inquisition in which christianity supplied the inner faith in the dangers of heresy, and western civilization brought into play the energy which made the exploitation of fire and fagot possible on an extravagant scale. The crusades were really a conflict between Bedouin civilization and western civilization working under the standards of Islam and Christianity respectively, with the difference that while on the one side Bedouin civilization and Islamic civilization were in general unison, western civilization and christian civilization were, on the other, sadly at variance. This is the secret of the ultimate result of the crusades. Here it is worthy of note that while the materials of the two religions were derived from the same source, the Prophet was born and brought up in a desert, whereas the Christ had his nativity in a land of plenty. The struggle for existence was hard in Arabia; it was mild in Palestine. Arabian civilization and western civilization primally existed in the same sort of psychological environment, but the Koran and the Gospels issued from hearts, filled with fiercely contrasted qualities. By accident the seeds of christanity were scattered in unfavourable soil, while those of Islam had the advantages of agreeable climate and soil. Naturally Islam showed greater innate power than Christanity, though superficially their success was not very unequal. Faith in Islam is still strong, but faith in christanity is fast decaying, and is in parts, moribund.

I shall conclude this foreward by stating what led me to write this book. Imperfection is the mark of creation. No civilization is, or can be, perfect, because man, the Creator of civilization is imperfect. One civilization is superior to another when it is progressive, and the other retrogressive. Progress means progress towards perfection. The misfortune is that there is

not light enough to enable us to see in what consists perfection. A civilization has many aspects, and progress in some of them may be outbalanced by regress in other aspects. Every aspect of civilization is characterised by a duality of opposites. There is opposition between spirituality and animality; between intellectuality and emotionality; between the higher and the lower emotions; between power and will; between master-morality and slave-morality; between absolute and circumstantial morality; between individualistic and socialistic tendencies; between masculinism and feminism; between love and hate; between self-interest and self-sacrifice and so forth. The duality is necessary for the very existence of civilization. The question is where to find the equilibrium between the opposites, and how to preserve it as a moving equilibrium. No civilization has so far succeeded in solving this problem. Great experience and culture are necessary for the solution. Culture is criticism of life, that is, of the life of the civilization under which the man of culture lives, as distinguished from the optimistic philistine, or the healthy-minded brute who has nothing to think of except his own cheerfulness.

It is good for a man to be perennially conscious of the character of the deficiencies and excellences of the civilization in which he lives, moves and has his being. It is good for a man to be in possession of a correct criticism of his civilization. Western civilization is receiving ample criticism from men who are living within it; and who, inspite of its defects are unwilling to sever connection with it, either philosophically, or politically or for the ordinary practical purposes of life. These criticisms relate to particular aspects; no adverse criticism from within could rationally include all the aspects of the civilization organized into a whole. Such piecemeal criticism is not very valuable, but is advantageous for negative purposes.

Finally it may be affirmed that though it may not be desirable, dignified, or pleasant "to see ourselves as we see others" it is useful to know how others see us. Criticism from beyond the frontiers may thus be useful, if it is made, not in a compromising nor in a pugnacious but in a scientific spirit which ignores everything except truth, and preserves nothing but the latter.

Very fierce light sometimes beats upon eastern civilization, particularly Indian civilization, radiating from the western sky.

America is gathering singular reputation in this matter. Indeed, real India is grateful for the sidelights thus thrown upon her civilization from outside. There are people whose pugnacity is aroused by such criticism, and Sir John Woodroffe, himself an outsider, filled with western, supplemented by eastern, culture could not check himself when Mr. Archer called India uncivilized. Feminism has recently brought to the front a learned lady who, hailing from America, spent more than a month in an Indian tour and never found any good in Indian civilization. India never thought of replying ; but noted the defects adverted to, for examination at leisure.

The present book is not written in the spirit in which Mr. Archer and Miss Mayo wrote theirs. It does not deal with particulars, but lays before the reader a few broad principles showing how western civilization has developed and is still growing, with prospects, half bright and half gloomy, before it.

K. C. SEN.

SIDE LIGHTS

ON

WESTERN CIVILIZATION

A precise definition of the term western civilization is impossible, because neither of the words of which it is composed admits of such definition. A rotund body as a whole cannot be divided, except arbitrarily, into east and west, for, the extreme west meets the extreme east ; while civilization is a complex conception which no philosopher dealing with it has yet attempted to define correctly. Ordinarily it is opposed to barbarism with a large border land of dubious character between them. Besides what is ordinarily known as civilization is not pure civilization but a mixture of two opposites. Neither western civilization nor any other civilization, which now exists in the world, or has ever existed in it, is free from the elements of barbarism. The fact that a civilization is dead is proof of the fact that it was impure, and contained elements of barbarism, which, helped by internal or external forces, ultimately overpowered it. The truth is that man has two aspects of life, between which conflict is more powerful than co-operation, and a civilization which favours the two aspects unequally, or favours one aspect at the expense of the other, lives a precarious life. It is true also that a satisfactory synthesis of the two aspects of life has not yet been made. It is futile therefore to expect a perfect civilization in a world where, it is uncertain whether spiritual life grows out of animal life by evolution, or is a distinct aspect, a special creation, in full or partial conflict with the latter, in a world where the psycho-physical problem is unsettled, where the psychic life is not only internally confused, but claims to guide the physical life ; where law and order is blended with freedom of will and the demands of expediency ; where natural necessity is supplemented by circumstantial calls of utility ; where immediate benefit stands in opposition to remote and ultimate benefit ; where the good of one part of humanity is in conflict with the good of another.

II. CULTURE AND CIVILIZATION.

The terms civilization and culture are often confused. Broadly speaking, civilization is the objective expression of culture. Culture is a creative process. Applied to the earth it creates foods and flowers, trees and plants, and is known as agriculture, horticulture, floriculture, arbori-culture, etc. ; Applied to living things it creates new lives, *e.g.*, in the pathological laboratory ; stock-breeding, slave-breeding and fancy-breeding are other examples of life-culture. Applied to the mind culture creates civilization. Menti-culture creates world views, and types of human character adjusted to them. It creates religion and moral judgment, supplies theories of life, and finds its meaning and purpose, encourages or disparages emotions and instincts in accordance with the theories and purposes, among a group of persons living in mutual juxtaposition or holding constant communication with one another. A particular culture evolves a particular system of life-forces, physical, moral and intellectual, which in their totality receive the name of civilization.

Confusion is created by the interplay of culture and civilization ; for civilization not only grows out of, and is guided by culture, but also reacts upon it and modifies it. Both civilization and culture are names of dynamic processes, though they are often applied to describe a static ensemble at a given period. Western civilization is not exactly what it was fifty years ago. It was long in embryo and infancy, but its later growth has been so stupendously plethoric that it is difficult to identify it with its childhood. It is not fully half a century since it received its unchristian name, though born and brought up in a christian land. The fact is christian culture is not its mother, but its step mother, who far from suckling, vigorously tried to strangle it in its cradle, and only succeeded in arresting its growth for some centuries.

III. THE NAME.

The name "western civilization" has come into vogue in very recent times. It was never used in the first half of the nineteenth century. The use of the name was at first limited, as an amorphous

conception, to platform and private conversation, whence it gradually found its way into the press. Literature at first reluctantly adopted it, though its enthusiasm grew afterwards, when the people of Asia, for centuries regarded as semi-civilized, claimed to have a complete civilization, in some respects higher than the new civilization of western Europe. Philosophers still hesitate to use the term. Benjamin Kidd indicates that while the conception was acquiring distinctiveness towards the close of the last century, language was not yet ripe to give it a distinct name, a name which would not only lay the full conception in view, but also exclude all extraneous, irrelevant, intrusively disposed ideas. Hence for want of a better name "western civilization" was adopted as it were tentatively. But since then aggressiveness on the part of Asia, mostly defensive but sometimes retaliatory, has added new strength to the name, and pugnacious literature is exhibiting extraordinary, even virulent, fondness for it.

The epithet 'western' is vague. It may refer to the western countries of Europe or to the western countries of the world. The conception of the new civilization called for a specific distinction from the then existing European civilization, as also from what is called christian civilization. European civilization was slow, amorphous, invertebrate. It referred to no particular culture. The name was erroneous because logically it ought to include the civilization of the Russian and Balkan Empires, which were geographically European and psychologically and racially Asiatic, until recently. Christian civilization was the civilization brought about by the unity of religion regulated by a suzerain authority enthroned at Rome. It lost its distinctive character with the reformation, and it was more or less completely disintegrated by the rapid advance of rationalism afterwards. In its time it had done its best to strangle the infant culture of western civilization, and logic demanded that the name of the new civilization should be free from its contaminative influence, while prudence suggested that no offence should be given to christian civilization in finding a name for it, for though it was the dead ghost of christian civilization it was still hovering over the lands occupied by western civilization. It might be possible to call it modern civilization but that would give an undesirable prominence to its contrast with ancient civilization, specially the civilization of Greece, to which it owed vital obligations. The

much advanced, but possessing in full measure the moral traits of western civilization, sexually amalgamated themselves with the natives, and created a conjugated culture of no high value either spiritually, or for purposes of self-preservation. It is now being tried in tropical and subtropical Africa on a minor scale in a somewhat half-hearted way. The colonists are for the most part the undesirable excess population of the old home, who are helped to migrate, more with the ultimate object of saving the state from the burdensome responsibility of providing for them in costly state-built houses under state management than for the benefit of civilization expected from expansion. These people, scattered over the continent, in coming into subordinative co-operative contact with the natives lapse into mixed forms of civilization. In India a persistent attempt is being made to superimpose upon the old civilization some of the elements of western civilization. The resulting amalgamation is a kind of slow poison which increases helplessness and susceptibility to the passive side of exploitation.

The people among whom western civilization now prevails in full vigour were uncivilized until very recent times in human life. They were mere savages when civilization of an advanced type existed in the neighbourhood. This civilization died out in the course of a few centuries, while the infant civilization of the northern peoples, growing in isolation into a vigorous child-hood, slowly came into contact with it. It is a remarkable fact in history that not only the civilization but the civilized people of Greece and Rome melted away as the so-called barbarians from the north expanded southward. They were barbarians no doubt in the sense that they had received no culture (as opposed to nature) but their bones and muscles, nerves and instincts, well trained by exercise in the struggle for existence, were in full trim, when they came in contact with the over-civilized peoples of the south. New theories of life, lofty in conception had already undermined the self-preservative character of the old civilization and contact with the new peoples made the struggle for existence hopeless for the old.

This is not exactly the place to discuss how mighty Greece and mightier Rome glided into the dark age, but it seems during this age the fresh people of the north were unconciously laying the natural foundation of a great civilization destined to puzzle and dazzle the world by its achievements more than a thousand years

later. The moralized, spiritualized and sophisticated instincts of the old, proved too soft in contrast with the hard, savage, but suitably tempered, cosmic instincts of the new peoples, stigmatised as the 'ape and tiger' qualities of human nature. These qualities served them beneficently not only against the Greeks and Romans, but also against all the northern peoples who had been softened and weakened by Roman rule and Roman civilization which rendered them incompetent for self-preservation. It was during this age that the process of natural selection eliminated from western Europe all its moral weakness ; and nomadism spread those peoples, who were competent for survival, over half the continent. It was these peoples that at the bidding of the Bishop of Rome, turned into an imitation Khalifa, under the title of Pope, stemmed the torrent of saracenic invasions, and saved the continent from the possible tyranny of Islamic barbarism. For purposes of western civilization the Dark age was perhaps better than the Middle age, when christian monks, unconscious of the possibilities which the dark age had created, tried to spread soft christian morality and civilization among a people who were destined in the ripeness of time to achieve undreamt of wonders. It is fortunate, christianity failed to make more than a superficial impression on the vast majority of the population.

V. HUMAN LIFE.

In the next section I shall deal with the cultural basis of civilization. But what is culture? Two mutually antagonistic authorities, Arnold and Huxley, are agreed that culture is criticism of life. Its purpose is to find the correct theory of life ; and civilization means living according to that theory. A knowledge of the facts of life is absolutely necessary for the determination of the value, meaning and purpose of life. The theory of life which gives it the highest attainable value is the correct theory of life. All other theories are judged by the comparative value which they give to life. In the actual result men pursue mixed theories of life to accommodate themselves to changeful environments. Life becomes incoherent, losing sight of its meaning and purpose. It pursues no fixed ideal, and drifts in a sea of doubts, with a current of instincts and impulses, unfettered by the guidance of reason. Such a life is a confused mixture of civilized and savage life.

The value of a civilization depends as much upon the effectiveness with which it enables man to pursue a particular theory of life as upon the distinctness of the knowledge of that theory. Human life is an extremely complex structure or process ; and excessive efficiency in any branch of it may be quite as injurious as defective effectiveness. It is doubtful whether any coherent theory of life can be beneficially pursued in all parts of humanity. Humanity as it exists at present is not an organic growth. Even the different societies into which it is divided are mixed structures, the several parts of which are differently affected by the common theory of life forced upon the whole.

The answer to the question, what is the value of a civlization, presupposes a given meaning and contents of life. What is life ? What are its relations to time and space ? To nature and neighbour, to the universe as a whole ? What makes it worth living ? What makes it more worth living or less worth living ? Where does life come from, and where does it end ? These questions have been answered in different ways, and the answers have given rise to different civilizations. The answers are given consciously, subconsciously or unconsciously. In any case they guide and control, help and hinder, advance or turn back the several forms of civilization.

What are the contents of life ? What is man ? What is known of him in the three aspects of being, doing and becoming ? Even here at the very threshold we are perplexed, because our knowledge is inadequate in quantity and imperfect in quality. Systematic analysis is impossible. Physiology is less advanced than anatomy ; and Psychology is less advanced than Physiology. I shall only enumerate a number of elements in the contents and activities of human life. I shall attempt no classification. I shall make the enumeration in a random fashion.

The human structure consists of body, mind and spirit. The body consists of bones and muscles, veins and arteries ; nerves and senses ; limbs and organs. The whole structure is maintained by blood, extracted out of foreign substances introduced into the body, circulating through the whole system. The mind includes consciousness, intellect, emotions, will, desires, impulses, inhibitions, etc. As to his activities man breathes, eats, drinks, secretes, ejects, speaks, moves ; knows, feels, wills, desires, enjoys, endures ; thinks, doubts, believes, rejects ; hopes, fears ; loves, hates ; approves,

disapproves; likes, dislikes; admires, reproaches, and so forth. He also creates and destroys; fights and makes peace; prays and scoffs; makes and unmakes. As to the spirit, it transcends both mind and body, and represents the essence of life.

VI. THE CULTURAL BASIS OF CIVILIZATION.

Culture is a complex conception. It means the process by which an ideal is pursued, as well as the realized ideal. Culture as a process is purposive in character. It implies conscious activity. It implies a cultivator. Self-culture identifies the cultivator with the mind cultivated. Self-culture strictly speaking is a contradiction in terms. It really means that the self plays a more important and active part in the process of culture than any outside factor, *viz.*, a teacher, a book or a phenomenon.

The ideal pursued in culture is a form of life, a mode of living, a mode of behaviour towards self and towards neighbours. The ideal may be simple or complex. It is simple when the same behahaviour is proposed towards all neighbours. Universal brotherhood is a pure simple ideal. Different modes of behaviour towards different neighbours imply a complex idea. Also different modes of behaviour towards the same neighbour at different times and under different circumstances form a complex ideal.

Behaviour towards neighbours proceeds from love or hate. Love and hate are not uniform. They vary in degree, and their meeting ground in the centre is called indifference. Culture which determines behaviour implies knowledge of the character and attitude of neighbours. That attitude may be friendly, hostile or indifferent. A neighbour may be a single person or a group of persons, combined for a particular purpose or for the general purposes of life. The individuals of a group need not leave behind them their individual personalities. Thus behaviour towards neighbours is a bewildering complex phenomenon, and the culture which determines it is necessarily perplexing. It is easy to say, 'love all mankind equally' or 'hate them equally.' But that is an unattainable, and probably an undesirable ideal.

Behaviour towards self and neighbours forms the most important branch of culture, for man is a social animal, and his life is passed among neighbours. Even when he deliberately chooses to live in solitude, he cannot completely avoid contact with the latter. He has to produce his necessities, or to buy them, and he can do neither without the help of neighbours. As civilization advances, contact between neighbours increases in frequency, closeness and breadth, and proper behaviour requires culture, growing in complexity and fineness. This culture is ordinarily known as moral culture. It is a branch of social culture, which also includes economic and political culture. Social psychology forms the foundation of this culture. It is the study of internal nature.

Next to behaviour towards self and neighbour stands behaviour towards external nature ; which is non-moral in its love and hate, in its beneficence and maleficence, in its resistence and submission. In short, its mode of behaviour towards man is guided by fixed laws which are simpler and less circumstantial than those which guide mutual behaviour between men. These laws are formulated in the physical sciences. External nature however includes living as well as non-living matter. It includes molar and molecular forces as well as vital forces, such as the muscular power, the feelings, instincts, impulses, intelligence of animals, The culture of external nature thus includes the study of Physics, Chemistry, Meteorology, Geology, Zoology, Biology, Physiology, animal psychology.

Lastly there is an unseen power or a number of unseen powers which force themselves upon our attention from the earliest times, refining themselves with our own progress in civilization, but seldom leaving contact with us. We find it impossible to eschew their company or to evade their obtrusions, or to reject their offer of help in our difficulties. They most come in contact with us in our troubles and tribulations, our misadventures and disasters. From their behaviour towards us we are impelled to contemplate them, to be attracted towards them, to love them, revere them, worship them and pray to them. They have gradually shaken off their plurality, and united themselves into a single whole. We try to assimilate the latter to the personality of a neighbour, and regard him as a friend, a father, a mother, a brother or a son. We pull him towards us, and He pulls us towards him. He does not descend but we ascend. Philosophic refinement assimilates the transcendental

into the immanental reality. It assimilates the objective to the subjective reality, and identifies it with the true self, dividing the personality of each of us into two selves, the real self and the apparent self, the higher self and the lower self, the divine self and the animal self, which last division regards man as a short link between God and beast, and human life as a necessary step in the ascent from the animal life to divine life. Behaviour towards the unseen power is the subject of spiritual life. The importance of this life lies in the fact that it vitally influences our practical, social life, and our behaviour towards earthly neighbours, to our friends and enemies, our servants and masters, our co-operators in production and predation, and in all the self-preservative activities of life, as well as in the belief that all ultimate good and beauty for man and society reside in it. The unseen invisibly guides the seen, and the almost universal will-to-believe in it is the best proof of its existence. This will is not only intuitive but pragmatic. It adds power to the victorious, and consolation to the defeated. It strengthens the adventurous, and brings hope to the hopeless. It is the driving force of life, manifesting itself immanently or transcendentally on all great occasions.

VII. BEHAVIOUR TOWARDS ONE'S SELF.

Man constantly feels the existence of destructive forces around and within him. Hunger, thirst and lust are demons that periodically call for gratification. They are resistless, specially the first two. Their demand is not illimitable or continuous. It is intermittent but insistent. This intermittency enables man to seek for the objects which gratify them. They come as enemies and insinuate themselves as friends. They give pleasure as well as pain. There is pleasure in worshipping them ; there is pain in the inability to gratify them. Poverty and infirmity are the objective causes of this pain. Social injustice and natural indolence add to its severity. The poor man runs to the factory or the money lender when hunger knocks at the door. In extreme cases he takes refuge in the work house. Hunger is represented as a wolf for the poor, and when he comes to the front door, with the breath shaking his frame, he sometimes runs through the backdoor preferring to hang

himself quickly from the nearest tree rather than be devoured slowly by the latter. For him the law of self-preservation has outreached itself.

Hunger is a loving goddess to the rich. Some people eat six times in twenty-four hours, and would gladly raise the number cent per cent if the kindly goddess felt no pangs of satiation. Rich men have invented games, such as foot ball, cricket, polo, hockey, golf, etc., by way of wooing the goddess, kept in trim.

The reward for worshipping these demon gods is self-preservation. There is not less truth than humour in the saying that the price paid for the preservation of life is life itself. Self-preservation and self-destruction are for most people synonymous. The loss is equal to the gain. The cost is equal to the value of the commodity. There is no surplus value.

Culture which gives surplus value to life requires leisure ; and leisure means surplus time saved from the labour of self-preservation. The family as a man's own creation is part of himself. Expansion of the self means increased cost of self-preservation. Civilization has advanced so fast that a man prefers to place limitations upon his expansive inclinations in order to secure preservation for his limited self. Little Englandism as contrasted with British Imperialism furnishes a satisfactory parabolic explanation of the situation. Polygamy is barbarous. Monogamy belongs to the state of semi-civilization. Advanced civilization cannot bear it. Selfhood represented by the family is transferred from the individual to the state. The individual is relieved from part of the cost of self-preservation in order that he may have leisure for self-culture, and may give himself higher surplus value.

Even with all these accommodating adjustments high culture is impossible unless the majority of the people accept the burden of labour required for the preservation of the minority in addition to what is required for their own self-preservation. The majority are now steadily refusing the disinterested part of the labour. The chances of high culture is thus diminishing by the pressure of civilization, and the surplus value of life runs the risk of a proportionate dimunition.

Leisure or the opportunity for culture which the few acquire at the expense of the many may be either wasted or utilised. It

may be utilised for the exclusive benefit of the usurper or for the benefit of all. Newton and Darwin used their leisure to the best advantage. They discovered laws of nature which have benefited the world eternally. The inventors of labour-saving machines richly deserve their leisure because they spend it for the benefit of mankind. They make it possible for wealth to be created automatically. They make it possible for men to have more leisure for purposes of culture. They are the best promoters of civilization.

Leisure, which means surplus time, or time saved from the work of immediate self-preservation may be spent in other ways also. It may be spent in spiritual devotion or in the enjoyment of the beauties of life. The longing for beauty is quite as great as the longing for spiritual enjoyment. Beauty is provided by Nature, and can be also created by Art. There is beauty scattered over the world, in the hills and valleys, in streams and lakes, in the woods and skies, in sunshine and rain, and most conspicuously in the faces of women, paradoxically enhanced by the antagonism of sex. There is beauty in sound, in form and colour, in smell and taste and touch. But these beauties have to be discovered and presented as objects so as to make them accessible to men and women. These are the beauties of Art. Music, painting, sculpture, jewellery, perfumery, confectionery and tailoring are the principal arts, to which may be added light literature, in prose or verse. I exclude heavy literature because the perception of beauty which lies hidden in it is intellectually tiresome. Civilized man craves for easy, superficial, striking beauty, recuperative to the nerves, exhausted by self-preservative labour.

Science and philosophy belong to a different category. The study of the latter brings enjoyment no doubt, but its purpose is cultural. There is more of utility than of beauty in it. Art also has a cultural value, but its primary purpose is to bring enjoyment, to afford relief from the dead emptiness of normal life, that is to say, life whose normal activities are self-preservative. It is a pity that civilization has degraded the normal life of man to a pathological condition which can be maintained in working order only by costly stimulants and expensive amusements, by nervous excitements and emotional thrills.

The theatre, the opera, the cinema and the circus have been invented for the benefit of those whose normal life is a life of

self-preservative labour. Some people speak disparagingly of these amusements as demoralizing factors in civilized life. But their criticism is misplaced and indiscriminating. It is the normal life which deserves adverse criticism, and not the amusement which enables that life to maintain itself. Civilization has made life abnormal, and there is urgent need to give it a new turn. Where, however, the normal life is one of preponderant leisure excessive attention given to these amusements in the hopeless endeavour to extract more enjoyment out of subjective emptiness is what deserves to be disowned ; for vice is a refuge from boredom sought by the indolent brain unacquainted with the creative value of time. The good things of life that attract the hungry soul produce nausea when consumed by the satiated glutton.

The comparative value of intellectual and emotional culture varies with the temperament and taste of the appraiser. When the two kinds of culture are combined in different proportions in any pursuit, difference of opinion regarding its value is inevitable. Much of the dispute between Arnold and Huxley was due to their temperament, in their plea for literature and science respectively. Science affords more intellectual culture and its results are more preservative, while literature supplies more emotional culture of a stimulative kind. The first is creative and the second recreative. The one is calculated to command and conquer the future ; the other is limited in its scope and effect to the present.

In spiritual culture also the intellectual and emotional elements are combined. There is philosophy as well as madness in religion. The one is creative, the other recreative. The one seeks for first principles, the other brings consolation in distress and distraction. The one is for the successful, the other for the frustrated. The one is for the buoyant spirit, the other for the submerged. Knowledge, faith and action (*Jnan*, *bhakti*, *karma*) are the three aspects of spiritual life. Doubt, infidelity and indolence hamper this life. Action in the spiritual sense is distinguished from action in its ordinary sense by the fact that it implies preservative labour, which exploits the self for the benefit of neighbours, while the latter exploits neighbours for the benefit of the self. It is touched by emotion to a greater extent than by the intellect. Civilization discovers that such action is often injurious in the long run, and heavily discounts emotional spirituality in its appraisement of values. Beneficence

in advanced civilization is an intellectual, more than an emotional, phenomenon. It takes into account long run social benefit more than the immediate welfare of the individuals directly affected.

The field of intellectual culture gradually expands into regions formerly occupied by the emotions. Knowledge and doubt conspire to chase spiritual faith out of existence, and with the disappearance of faith reverence takes to flight. Spiritual irreverence leads to a general lack of reverence for life, and butcheries and slaughter-houses throw altars and temples into abysmal shade, while human sacrifice assumes a gigantic magnitude in new colour and form. The deity that presides over natural selection is different from the deity that opens Heaven's gate to the faithful.

The ameliorative social forces, enlightened by science often act in antagonism with divine commands based upon individualistic considerations. These commands were promulgated in primitive times when society was in infancy, and its undeveloped organism was loosely held together. With the progress of civilization the self, which contracts its domesticity, expands into society ; and its relations to neighbours are modified by the interests of the enlarged self, which are often antagonistic to the interests of private personalities.

VIII. BEHAVIOUR TOWARDS NEIGHBOUR.

By neighbour I mean all mankind, severally and jointly. No man is exactly like another, physically, intellectually or morally. The relations of one man to another vary with time and circumstances. The institution of property and the general injustice of social conventions are powerful factors which call forth discrimination between one man and another in the attitude of a particular individual towards them. The ordinance "Love thy neighbour as thyself" issued by the supreme personality, endowed with infinite intelligence, infinite goodness, and illimitable foresight, who himself discriminated between Abel and Cain with tremendous effect, affecting the destinies of mankind, and who still discriminates between the prayerful and the recalcitrant soul, between the miser and the man of charity, is a hopeless ideal, which is not improved by the imperative tone in which it is conveyed. One man may rise superior

to another in character, opulence and power, but no man can transcend god. The utmost he can do is to imitate Him and be a true image of him. Buddha's law of Ahimsa does not fall far below this ordinance in loftiness and inwardness. It has a subjective as well as an objective aspect. Envy, jealousy, ill-feeling, pleasure at the sight of misery are all forbidden. Buddha was astute enough not to give the ideal a hortative didactic directness. But a lamentable lack of the sense of proportion is vissible in both the ideals. They are eastern in origin, and their diffusion in the sturdy and practical west has been accepted as a matter of etiquette only. In the east they have produced a deeper impression no doubt, but achievement lags far behind the ideal.

The doctrine of universal love is confused by the division of the self into the real and the apparent, the ideal and the actual, the higher and the lower, the purged and the impure self. If the higher self is meant to be the true object of love the doctrine loses most, if not all, of its practical value. The real self needs no help from outside. It is God immanent in man according to some schools of thought, and the image of god in each man according to other schools. The self of neighbour is a mere abstraction in either case, for, neither God nor His image has been empirically discovered in man. The God revered by man is the transcendental God, and if He is to be loved, the original is better than the copy. Further, we do not know what God is like, or how far the image resembles the original.

Man, as he actually is, deserves very little love. He is not lovable. He may be pitied and helped in distress, but real love would be wasted upon him.

At the same time the Gospel of equal hate for all mankind is equally unacceptable. The law of universal Hate has not been explicitly enunciated, except perhaps by Hobbes, who traced the origin of society to the desire to avert the inconvenience of the pre-social war of each against each and all. The social transmutation, it must be mentioned, was not intended to substitute universal love for universal hate, but to introduce useful discrimination in the allocation of hate.

The law of Natural Selection evades the problem of Hate by artfully isolating the struggle for existence from its teleological implications, and we are told that the survival of the favoured races

is not effected by the operation of favour, but by their own power and cunning. Favour does not produce survival, but survival creates the illusion of favour. Neo-Darwinism with the light of Pragmatism, which did not shine in Darwin's time, has reverted to the natural interpretation of favour. However confused the idea at the bottom may appear to be under the oblique glances of logic, and whatever old women of either sex may urge against it, honest statistics lead to the conclusion that Neo-Darwinism supplies the root principles of practical morality, and neighbourly behaviour at the present day. Weakness in man or beast being the expression of divine disfavour, humane support accorded to it is rebellion against imperial design; and hate and suppression, exploitation and extermination, of the weak and contaminative, indicate the correct psychology and the appropriate mode of behaviour designed for the strong. That is the law of social progress and civilization, the ultimate goal of which lies in the establsihment of the kingdom of power and prosperity, of satisfaction and satiety. The practice of morality based upon this theory is older than the self-consciousness of man. It is the first principle of social organization, and of its expansion and development. The early stages of civilization are particularly marked by the subconscious notion of divine discrimination between the weak and the strong, imposing upon each of them an appropriate code of behaviour tending to the progress of civilization, which is uppermost both in the human and divine mentality.

To the strength of body man added the strength of cunning, and his first achievements towards power and peace consisted in the conquest of the arborial world; and having purged this world of woods and wild animals man proceeded to purge society of the weak and the womanish. The practice, however, lacked the support of a formulated all-comprehensive theory until the middle of the nineteenth century when Darwin discovered the law of Natural Selection, or survival of the fittest for the animal world, whence it was not very difficult to extend it to human life, for Darwin lived long enough to trace the descent of man, and to take a further step on the line adopted by him in the origin of species. Christian tradition offered a feeble resistance, but was soon reduced to an attitude of apologetic weakness of its own position, as disclosed in the Book of Genesis, a compendium of cosmology, zoology, biology, psychology, pathology and other sciences, published under divine authority.

The truth is both Love and Hate are discriminative ; but while Love has a contracting tendency Hate has one towards expansion, with progress of knowledge, which, divested of insincerity, and clever concealment, is a development of the old 'cunning' which enabled our hoary forbears to prepare the world for society and civilization. Universal fraternity was proved by Cain to be a piece of sham psychology. Patriotism without international pugnacity is invertebrate, and divested of communal conflict it is insipid. High thinkers are ashamed to acknowledge the existence of patriotism in their hearts. Love has gradually restricted itself to the family, and the family, since the discovery of the law of population, and that of diminishing return, has been dwindling to the vanishing point, thanks also to feminism and sex war, and contraceptives.

Hate on the other hand has been expanding from the individual to the small group ; from the latter to large groups ; from country to continent ; from the continent to the world at large, thanks to Columbus and Vasco Da Gama, to Drake and Hawkins, to explorers and exploiters, to squatters and colonists, to promoters of civilization in general. Hate expands with the expansion of knowledge ; and knowledge grows with the advance of civilization, and civilization grows with the expansion of Hate. At one time it was supposed that Hate would vanish with the extermination of all hated objects. But Hate is creative. When driven to bay and to risk of starvation it loses the "consciousness of kind" and like the polar bear licks its own paw. Man hates himself when he has none else to hate.

It seems marvellous no attempt has ever been made to preach the doctrine of indifference towards neighbours without detracton from self-love, specially when it is remembered that indifference-towards God and divine intervention is supported by growing propaganda, both in the world of science and philosophy, and the world of practical and political life. The indifference of hindu philosophy is undiscriminating. It comprehends indifference to entire creation, the external expression of Maya or Divine lapse, due to momentary incircumspection. The Gospel of love is preached extensively and openly, specially, by men who have nothing better to do, and who live by preaching it, charging small remuneration because higher remuneration is not available. The Gospel of Hate is practised widely and devotedly though seldom preached or owned. The

practice is cleverly covered by self-love, and sometimes even by altruistic profession. The Gospel of Hate is pragmatic only when supported by hypocrisy, that inherent and perennially interesting factor in human psychology. It is dangerous when openly avowed, and is so avowed only in war time.

Indifference creates no enemies, though it creates no friends either. But seeing that there is a discouraging abundance of the first, and a lamentable scarcity of the second, the balance of advantage gained by indifference would be considerable for the world at large. The completely indifferent or detached personality in the higher planes of hindu thought commands widespread reverence, but that kind of comprehensive indifference is destructive for practical purposes of life ; Indifference to neighbours, while it makes no difference to self-love and self-preservation, creates an atmosphere of peace and happiness, though it may not bring much surplus wealth or superfluous power. But human appraisement is unreliable. The progress of science and philosophy does not tend to make it more reliable, and it is difficult to say whether peace or power, happiness or hazardous opulence forms the real ideal pursued by man.

IX. BEHAVIOUR TOWARDS NEIGHBOUR (*continued*).

Discriminating love and hate create differences ; and differences by reaction, intensify the discriminating propensity of love and hate. They have enabled men to organize society and to give a start to civilization. Every society is a composite empire, the members of which are so inter-related, and act so closely in contact that until recent times people saw the hand of God behind it, and regarded it as sacrosanct. The subjects of each empire bore their tyranny for ages in tranquility, and when a local upheaval disturbed one of the empires, the subjects of the other empires joined the rulers to suppress it. So thorough was the tyranny thus established that the very psychology of the subjects deviated from the natural streams into new channels called 'second nature'. In course of time this second nature, the network of excavated channels, came to be regarded as the original immutable nature of man. Mere alluvial clay became petrified into granite by the force of gravitation and

inertia operating for ages. The highest achievements of western civilization seems to be the creation of a tendency towards the disruption of the composite empire. It is too early to predict the future of the new movement, but the growing tendency is as clear as broad day light. The subjects, so long so utterly hopeless, of the different empires, appear to have formed with a bewildering quickness a huge conspiracy to invade the great empire from different sides. The rulers are already trembling in fright, and, like cowards, entering into terms of compromise, in the hopeless endeavour to arrest the surging tide of rebellion, which moves from salient to salient with an invisible penetrative force. Women, workers, the credulous, and the weak alien seem all combined against the confederated enemy.

The different empires of the confederation are the empires of Property, Sex, Religion and Race. The confederated empire, as ordinarily known is the State. To be more explicit the four empires are (1) the empire of the few over the many (2) the empire of man over woman, (3) the empire of the supernatural over the natural man, and (4) the empire of race over race. The underlying divine principle running through all of these is that of the empire of the strong over the weak, under the ministership of self-love.

It is said that of all rights that of conquest is the most honourable and the most indisputable. It takes precedence of natural right, rational right, legal right, historic right, pre-historic right, and vested rights of all sorts. For, inspite of the suggestions of casuistry and sophistication 'might' stands at the bottom of right. War is the final arbiter in all cases of disputed right irrespective of the culture and civilization of the parties concerned, and the divine law is that the victorious shall rule the vanquished. As a matter of fact there is not a single country in the world owned and governed by its original inhabitants. All original inhabitants have either become aboriginal by subjugation, or disappeared altogether.

The divine law does not confer a mere precarious right, for the wise conqueror seldom leaves in the hands of the conquered enough might to encourage the latter to dispute his ownership and rulership within the predictable future. The Duke of Skull was a wise-conqueror, who left no power in the defeated cultivator to get up and retaliate or even remonstrate. He had killed him with one blow and no word ; and when he had achieved this, men gathered

from all sides, and saluted him as Greatauk the Great, the future king of the Penguin Island. It was a divine instinct that impelled these men to humiliate themselves spontaneously and to present their duties to a man who until the blow was struck was a commonplace creature like one of them. Alexander, Caesar and Napoleon are all descended from him in a direct psychological line.

Heaven helps those who help themselves is a supernatural and superhistorical fact. Smiles did not discover this law.

Struggle for existence and struggle for ascendancy are virtually different names for the same kind of struggle. God created the struggle for existence by a redundancy of curses, which made bread without sweat impossible, and turned the sub-soil into hard rock, while He endowed Eve with unmanageable love and fecundity. Cain created the struggle for ascendancy by turning himself from an accursed fugitive to a diabolic brigand and conqueror. He invented the sword, the bow and the arrow, while his old father delved with his pick axe, and his mother kept spinning and conceiving. The two struggles are coeval with the fall of man. The relation of civilization to these two struggles differentiates one civilization from another. What is the object of civilization? There are two contradictory answers. One says the object is to harden the struggles. The other says it is to put an end to them. Both sides largely appeal to Darwin for support. A third view is that the object of civilization is to soften the struggle for existence and harden the struggle for ascendancy. The reaction of the softening and hardening of the struggles upon civilization produces a complicated situation which baffles all attempts at disentanglement and solution. As a rule the softening of the struggles softens and weakens civilization, and hardening them hardens it, and increases its power. In the East civilization has been weakened by the softening of the struggles. In the West the hardening of the struggles has hardened civilization. There is a clash of ideals involved. The conflict between spiritual and self-preservative civilization holds the cue in its hand.

X. THE FIRST EMPIRE : THE EMPIRE OF PROPERTY.

The empire of property, of the rich over the poor, of the few over the many, seemed natural, necessary and sacred, until recently. The King was opulent ; his ministers were wealthy and the underlings of government were well-to-do. They were not public servants, but a hierarchy of rulers. The King was divinely appointed, and his ministers shared his divine purity. The whole institution was endowed with sacrosanctity. But it is now assailed as unnatural, unnecessary, iniquitous and intolerable.

But apart from the hierarchy of the rich ruling class property by itself confers on the owner the power of commanding the people and of plundering them in barbaric or civilized ways. The advance of civilization has so far meant the progress of refinement in the methods of plunder.

Property and power have a mysterious mutual attraction. Power adds to property, and property enhances power. The result is that the ruling class is identified with the propertied class in all their aspects, good and evil. The truth is that property necessitates and maintains government, and government helps and augments property. Monarchy, aristocracy and plutocracy are monochromatic. They are sisters under their skins.

The empire of property which has been regarded as sacred for long ages has now lost most of its sanctity. It has lost the mystery which surrounded its origin, maintenance and progress in the eye of all impartial men. Even the staunchest supporters of property are to-day appalled by the colossal accumulations of wealth on the one hand, and ineffable privation and squalor on the other.

For ages man could not explain how property and power originated, maintained and expanded themselves, and by what kind of influences, good or evil, they elevate the owners and endow them with dignity, and proportionately degrade and humiliate the rest of mankind. He ascribed the ownership to Luck, to God's act, to something which he could not explain. Few had property, and many were poor. The former were supposed to receive preferential treatment from the supreme ruler of the universe. Property was heritable, because the gifts and curses of God are heritable. The original curses are still, after five thousand years, oppressing mankind, and oppressing them with increasing violence.

To feel jealousy against the rich and to try to pull them down was rebellion against divine law and divine rule. They kept a hierarchy of priests, and built churches at great expense for propaganda work on this line ; and the latter kept the primitive psychology of the people in orthodox, peaceable order. Even the thought entertained by the poor, of rising to the level of the rich was wicked. The founder of Christanity bestowed inexpensive blessings on the poor, and induced them to remain poor. The formula of the needle and the camel was enough to enlighten the poor in regard to divine retributive justice.

The empire of property began to show signs of decay with the growth and diffusion of culture. Education is now free in the civilized countries, and culture of a sort is now diffused over the entire population. The empire is still erect, but it is ramshackle. Man has come to realize that the hand of God was never behind it. They are ashamed to look back upon the ignorance of their ancestors, who were not acquainted with Moloch and Mammon, and who allowed themselves to be sacrificed with the innocence of sheep, buffalo and camel.

The empire of property is objectionable because it creates pride and vanity in the owners, and a sense of humiliation and distress in others. It makes equality impossible ; and inequality removes the chances of the coming of universal fraternity ; and where equality and fraternity are absent liberty refuses to come. Thus it is clear that neither the ideal of Christian civilization nor that of western civilization can be attained while the empire of property continues its tyranny.

Mystery is the mother of wonder, and wonder is the mother of admiration, reverence, fear and awe. Mystery is another name for ignorance. If the cultured mind still wonders, the reason is that its culture is inadequate. Man wonders at what he cannot explain. He admires what he can only half explain. Men wonder, fear and revere in the darkness of night, and laugh at themselves when morning brings light. They then regret their overnight experience and find fault with themselves for emotions which they had no power to control. Mysteries, gods and spirits overcrowded the landscape in primitive times. They have gradually quitted the the civilized world and gone into exile. They may return with the decay of culture and civilization. They cannot bear the conquering

light of these forces. The mystery of property has vanished, and men are now engaged in making plans to replace this empire by one of equality, fraternity and liberty.

In the civilized countries at the present day the majority of the people, that is, the subjects of the empire of property as contrasted with the rulers, have obtained sufficient light to know the origin of private property, and the mode in which it is maintained and enlarged. The Duke of Skull stands revealed from head to foot. He has the heart of the devil, the brains of the devil and the arms of the devil. He is the devil incarnate all over. He has civilized himself enormously specially during the last century. He is now a monarch, aristocrat, plutocrat, diplomat, military general and captain of Industry rolled into a single personality. He has also acquainted himself with the helpful principles of civil law, of biology, plutology, sociology and psychology. He knows the Christian scriptures and quotes them with great advantage without any faith in their truth. He regularly attends church and prays to God that the labouring herd may be kept as innocent and pure, as orthodox and devoted as they were in the middle ages. Subjectively he is a thorough man of science. Objectively he is a perfect churchman. He largely subscribes to philanthrophic institutions, to church and mission funds, and recoups himself with interest by the industrial and commercial advantages which they enable him to realize. He organizes sports and games for the young workers, excursion trains for both young and old, and occasionally gives them a hearty meal and a Cinema show. His biography may be unbiassedly summarised as follows. The facts and principles of life have been gathered from vast bibliographical mines, quarries and fields. This will be obvious to the reader as he proceeds with the perusal.

The Duke of Skull was born on the eve of the organization of society, and took a leading part in establishing it. Indeed it was he who drafted the most vitally important clauses of the contract by which the organization was brought about.

In his youth he murdered the tribes on his frontier, and plundered their effects and belongings, which he quickly squandered, and rushed to war again. As he grew up in years and wisdom he made slaves of the vanquished enemies, and wives of their women. He found this method of behaving towards neighbour to be highly advantageous, both for productive and reproductive purposes, that

is, for augmenting wealth and increasing population. He divided the population into warriors and workers. The latter enabled him to produce wealth, and the former helped him to plunder it. Production and predation worked simultaneously to augment his possessions.

It was rather long before he discovered that frontier wars did not pay, and slave work was unprofitable ; and then like a saintly sage christian he adventurously emancipated the slaves and renounced his polygamous habits.

He helped Columbus and Vasco Da Gama and the entire band of explorers, to go round the world in order to convert the heathens into sound workers, and to induce them to renounce their belongings, and to teach them that heaven which was accessible only to the poor was a much better place to live in than this nasty world, filled with moral filth and religious doubts. He provided the adventurers with gun and powder to meet extreme cases. He was disappointed to find that the Bible was a failure, and the bottle was slow in its operation. But undismayed he ordered the free use of gun and powder which in the course of a couple of centuries succeeded in replacing the recalcitrant, devil-touched, coloured populations of America by white men. This was an undreamed of triumph. But the triumph was largely due to a higher ratio of reproductive to productive growth at home. Further, the fecundity of the new women in the New World kept good pace with the fertility of the fresh, virgin soil. But with all that it was soon discovered that there was more work than worker.

The noble Duke, who had managed his affairs so brilliantly so long was not daunted by the new situation. He sent out men to hunt for slaves in the wilds of Africa. He did not hesitate to resume his ancient barbaric habits, which lay dormant but not dead within his heart,—habits which were founded on the sound ethical and plutological principle which identified usefulness with goodness, and the kingdom which Christ refused on the mountain with the kingdom which he intended to establish in the plains.

The new slavery was very inexpensive at first. The slaves were found crowded on the sea coast, and captured and loaded in ships like flocks of sheep, and transplanted across the Atlantic. The thriving trade attracted more adventurers, and the coasts were

soon exhausted. Then the African chiefs were employed as brokers and *beparis*, purchasers and commission agents, to decoy the flocks grazing in the hinterland, and to drive them into the ships, where they were packed like dead mutton, preserved in salt and ice, to be sold as live workers in the New World. If they showed signs of life and refractoriness they were thrashed and made to dance on the deck. If they got rancid they were flung into the sea.

Slave labour proved very satisfactory. It was a sort of cheap, living machinery, kept in fairly good working order by inexpensive lubrication, and which it was seldom worthwhile to repair when it went wrong. It was simply thrown away and replaced from the cheap slave market. For a century or so the system worked very well. In the meantime two factors were invisibly operating to put an end to this savage industrialism, *viz.*, (1) the wilds of Africa were getting exhausted and becoming increasingly unprofitable, and (2) the fecundity of women outgrew the fertility of the soil at home, and the time did not take long in coming when plutology suggested the substitution of free white labour for the fettered black labour of Negro slaves.

Slavery was abolished in two stages. First the slave-trade was penalized, and then slavery was knocked out. Christian civilization and western civilization, generally at loggerheads, combined to share the struggle of the hard business. The latter was shrewd enough to disclaim credit for the achievement. At least he was shrewd enough to publicly declare the triumph of christian civilization without claiming any share in the glory. The truth is he usurped the reality of the result, and left the vanity of it to be enjoyed by his fair co-worker. He ate the pulp and left the stone of the fruit for her. Christian civilization felt the breath of rejuvenation in her soft trained senility when she recollected with pride that in her youth she had killed white slavery with her broomstick, and now in her declining years she had killed black slavery, after having passed a regime of imbecility and of failure to use the necessary contraceptive in regard to the latter's birth and contra-meliorative in regard to its growth. The stigma, she fancied which is tersely expressed by the term 'old woman' was no longer applicable to her. It is a pity she failed to see that white slavery of a more invidious type was already causing distress at home. Christian civilization has never been renowned for intellectual acumen, but she never

betrayed a greater banality and inanity than she did on this occasion. The Duke of Skull was so deeply thankful to her that he promised her largesses to carry on mission work among the coloured heathens leaving the white heathens and heretics at home to be dealt with on the pragmatic principles approved by western civilization. It is remarkable that not only old women of the masculine sex, but young women of their own sex are finding useful occupation in the mission field at the cost of the noble Duke, who never loses sight of the proportion between cost and consequence, between outgoings and income. In Chota Nagpur and among the pariahs of the Madras Presidency coolie and convert are becoming convertible terms.

XI. THE FIRST EMPIRE (*continued*).

This white slavery formed a thorny problem in the nineteenth century. In some respects it was worse than Negro slavery. It affected the national morality of the masters. It divided the nation into hostile camps, and threatened to make it invertebrate. It corrupted the women and disabled the children, and vulgarised the men. It made the workers a class of outcastes ; and made the middle class speak of themselves as the 'people'. In short, the system demoralized the aristocracy, brutalized the proletariat, debased the nation, and darkened the future of civilization.

White slavery has largely changed its character now, and the term has now lost much of its old sting and meaning, at least in England, where it sprung into existence first, developed into advantageous rascality first, achieved its chief mission first, and came under reformative principles first, declined in productive power first, and bids fair to be transfigured into socialism first.

Slavery means work without due wage. It connotes for the worker (1) want of reasonable freedom, (2) want of fighting power, (3) want of leisure and (4) want of property or surplus income, that is, wages above the limit prescribed by nature and convention for immediate self-preservation. In the beginning white slavery was characterised in all these ways, to which was added the first disa vantage that accidents affecting flesh, bone, health and life could

claim no compensation from the employers, though they might be directly traceable to the incidents of employment in a stupefying atmosphere, deafening sounds and frightful sights acting upon starving stomachs and exhausted nerves. There was the further disadvantage of partial freedom, which led to reproductive associations, and created unbearable burdens. The freedom of the instincts unaccompanied by the power of foresight and voluntary inhibition is more dangerous than the utter want of it. It had another disadvantage for the white slave, as compared with negro slave. The slavery was supported by illegal contract, dressed in the drapery of legality, which attached responsibilities divested of rights to the worker, who in cases of distress was called upon to thank himself alone. A contract may be obtained by intimidation, external or internal. It is criminal when external intimidation takes advantage of the intimidation of hunger, and of the fears of the future. Internal intimidation is more efficient than external, because there lies no appeal to the law courts against it. The worst thing about this slavery was that the advantages which accrued to the employer by harshness were out of proportion to the mischief done to the worker. The employer was tempted by his own nature, whose selfishness was kindled into a blaze by the commercial advantages of cruelty. Every pice taken out of the wages of the worker doubled itself on its way into the pocket of the employer. In the course of three generations England accumulated vast wealth, half of which was squeezed out of the workers' flesh and blood, and the other half from the pockets of foreign consumers. National prosperity more than justified sectional debasement and misery. The conception of society as an organism, by its illegitimate application to practical life, benefited one section at the cost of another. Napoleon said, "I am France". The English capitalists said, "We are England". Rhetoric deceived England, and the visible result at present is that England has lost her primacy, and America has turned filial piety into friendly pity. Dean Inge has made himself famous for gloomy thoughts towards England, founded upon this change of relative psychology. Other nations are appealing to Nemesis for retributive justice, and girding up their loins to prove their earnestness. Primacy in property and power is the goal which every great nation wishes to attain under the urge of western civilization. Jealousy is its driving force, and circumvention has largely replaced open hostility as its method.

The Duke of Skull with all his shrewdness had failed to take adequate account of one very vital circumstance in the incidence of employment. Congestion is unfavourable to the workers in many ways, but gives opportunities for association and collective action. As distress increased among the workers discontent was impregnated with communal self-consciousness. The slightest assertion of self-consciousness among the workers roused similar self-consciousness among the employers; and the opposing forces like positive and negative electricity, intensified themselves into occasional explosions in the shape of strikes and lockouts. The Duke at first laughed at the impudence of the workers, who were bound to be reduced to submission by starvation, if by nothing else. He was proud to reflect that he had wisely acted in keeping wages at the starvation point, which kept the workers' war chest perennially empty. The government, he was sure, was bound to accord him preferential treatment by the law of self-preservation. For sometime this proved correct. Laws were enacted to prevent combination and organization. In England the first Combination Acts were passed in 1799 and 1800 A.D. These proved successful, and in 1824 the law was softened, but in twelve months government discovered its mistake, and hardened the law again. This law remained in force until 1875 A.D., when it was relaxed for the benefit of the nation.

The State is a combination, albeit, of huge dimensions. Interference with minor combinations has a strong tendency to weaken the major combination by repercussion. The State is interested in teaching the people to combine. It is against its interests to break up combinations. The national combination, while it directs attention to aggression and defence against foreign combinations of the same nature, benefits the nation. Trade unions benefit half the nation. Capitalist Syndicate benefits another half. Civilization advances by war more than by peace. It strengthens war psychology for its own advancement. Peace, particularly, lasting peace, deadens it. Life means war, war against natural and conventional forces. Peace means sleep. Lasting peace is death.

The Duke failed to discern that the State, though closely associated with property, was a distinct organization, and could live and thrive in isolation from it and that it had the power of weakening the empire of property, of abolishing it in case of necessity, without detriment to itself. He relied too much on state aid, and

was afterwards disappointed to find the state assuming an attitude of impartiality, and occasionally even inclining towards preferential treatment to the mob. The party government of England is no longer divided between tories and whigs, or conservatives and liberals, but between capitalism and socialism, between the Duke and his slaves, between private property and national or nationalised wealth. Nationalisation has been steadily advancing. Refined water, night light, conservancy and fuel supply in the form of gas, transport and locomotion, post and telegraph, are already largely socialized, municipalised or nationalised.

Every organization carries within it seeds of its own destruction. Society primarily divided into rich and poor, gradually developes a middle class, a species of bats, which claims kindred with beasts or birds at convenience. This fluid mass, which under ordinary circumstances acts as an adhesive force between the two poles of society, shows its explosive power when heated beyond a given point. The growth of the middle class is accelerated by the progress of Industrial civilization. This growth manifesting itself in two directions leads to the creation of plutocracy and genteel poverty. The plutocrats, at first hated, are eventually merged in the aristocracy by the process of bartering in blood. The plutocrat is the brother-in-law of the aristocrat ; he is either his sister's husband or his wife's brother. The aristocracy is a limited body. It dies by proliferation. The plutocracy has an indefinite growth. In some newly civilized countries the want of an aristocracy is more than compensated for by the creation of a gigantic plutocracy. At present plutocratization in the civilized world is advancing with tremendous speed, and genteel poverty is inciting the poor to rebellion.

The Duke of Skull, compelled by social necessity to excnange his blue blood for base lucre, is now a landowner, money-lender, manufacturer, trader and speculator, rolled into a single personality. The empire of property is now united and consolidated under the name of Capitalism. The Duke, under the name of the Capitalist, lives upon rent, interest, dividend and profit, squeezed from tenants, borrowers, wage-earners and consumers, who look upon him as a vampire let loose upon society, for the vast majority of the people belong to one or more of the four classes, who entertain towards the tyrant such truculent feelings in boiling temperature that the Duke may well be said to be living on the crater of a volcano.

Increasingly left in the lurch by the State he depends more upon luck and Providence, the last refuge of imbecility and despondence, than upon his own innate power invigorated by hope. The fact is that the empire of private property is threatened with the deluge of nationalization, the harbinger of socialism.

A brief account of the four classes of the oppressed may be found useful. The tenant having passed through the successive stages of slavery, serfdom, villeiny and yeomanhood, has left his ancestral home in the country side, and is living in congested tenements in manufacturing towns, as a white slave, courteously called a worker or wage-earner. He attained the highest dignity as a yeoman, who helped the king in his aggressive exploitation in foreign lands, and helped the adventurous Duke to make and unmake kings. He has fallen deepest, but he is recovering now.

In the middle ages there was little borrowing, for the money lender was reserved for eternal perdition by the interdict against usury. The empire of property was starved by its faith in christianity. But Mammon came like a thief in the night, and while tolerating the old borrower in distress, created a dignified class of borrowers, adventurers, company promoters, entrepreneurs and profiteers. The usurer became a financier and shareholder in the money-making, mammon-worshipping trade. This business is thriving most in the world at present. Money-lending and money-borrowing are now a sort of exchange of courtesy in the internal relationships of the plutocracy. Gold and Silver remain in hiding, and a piece of paper handed from bank to bank declares to the world colossal responsibilities and rights created by it. If this piece of paper were by accident destroyed national wealth would not suffer, but only the borrower or the lender. It has in the course of the Great War and subsequently, ruined lots of people, and weakened the empire of property. I believe it was the Jews who invented and developed this mysterious, miraculous paper, which has raised the German Empire from the abyss of bankruptcy, after the Great War.

The worker in his present massive form is a creation of the steam engine in conjugation with capital. There were small bodies of workers scattered all over the country-side before. The steam engine, fed upon coal, brought them together into congested centres of business. By the Malthusian law they reproduced faster than

they produced. But the production was enormous. At the same time creatures never intended by God to be wage-earners, were drawn into the vortex. Women and men crowded into holes gave an impetus to population undreamed of in the annals of human growth. In England population quardrupled in the course of a century. England, which had preserved reproductive modesty for ten centuries, shook off her veil at the sight of the steam engine, and let herself go with barbaric speed. The other countries of Europe have followed her example, so much so that European capital unable to find sufficient nourishment for the new comers shoot them out into the new world, like the New York Municipality, which shoots rubbish into the Atlantic. Workers grow like bees and ants, red and white, inspite of Malthus, who discovered the devil, but failed to turn him back. The State does not interfere because it has discovered another law, which reverses, for the top layers of society, the Malthusian law of the ratio of progress between production and reproduction. The bottom must replenish the top. The top must be kept going with inferior blood, because superior blood is drying up in western civilization.

The wage-earners have suffered most. Their self-consciousness was strangled in its infancy by the Combination Act of 1800 A.D., which remained in force for seventy-five years. They are the most self-conscious now, and they rule the country at present. They have been helped by those who feel "the consciousness of kind" with them, and more specially by those who are driven by the urge of envy, the greatest civilizing force in western civilization. They are supposed to have become vindictive and revengeful now. The more they advance the more obstreperous they become. In the early days of the mechanical revolution they were treated like beasts of burden. They were huddled up in tenements like Negro slaves who were packed in ships like ballast. Their women and children were dragged out of their home by threats of starvation, and corrupted and emaciated to that extent that the State became alarmed by the thought that the prosperity of the country had been obtained by paying famine price, by exchanging bones and muscles for pounds and pence, for coal and iron. The State felt that it had been misled by the Duke and his retainers who represented themselves as 'the real people' of the country. The Duke himself, as manufacturer, was getting anxious. He felt that he had violated the law of conservation as applied to nourishment and muscular strength, and that

the work extracted out of skeletons leads to diminishing return. So he too did not offer much serious resistance when the State asked him for subscription to improve the health of the wage-earning class. The latter were so exasperated by previous neglect that they were prepared for direct action in case the State proved recalcitrant. The threat of direct action roused the State from its slumber of indifference. It felt that the ship of State might turn turtle, and send to the bottom of the sea the whole hierarchy from the admiral to the common sailor. The condition of the worker has so far improved that he can now command the Duke to pay super-tax and death duty. He expects in the near future to command him to eat bread in the sweat of his brow, not such excessive sweat as he has himself been accustomed to exude, but sweat in a moderate measure, calculated by competent authorities like Russell and Shaw, to result from four hours' work out of twentyfour each day. He expects, in short, to introduce socialism, to take equal work from all and give equal remuneration to them. He is a true Christian desirous of fulfilling the wishes of God, who cursed man to the law of compensation which requires every man to pay in work for what he consumes. Civilization took this law as if it were meant for society as an organism, and not for each individual in detail. The worker intends to abolish the difference between producer and consumer, erroneously effected, and so long diabolically maintained, by civilization. He is at heart an individualist, though his method is collective. He considers the organic conception of society as the result of the cerebrations of an idle brain, the true workshop of the devil. He will provide adequate leisure for art, religion and literature but not excessive leisure to expose the brain to God's enemy. He will put an end to the struggle for existence from which every person suffers individually, and destroy the monster of a *Survivor*, who is at present regarded by science as the fittest person in social life, so that the rest of humanity may live in peace and happiness; for this dragon is supposed by political biologists to devour the weaker brotherhood. He is sometimes called 'superman,' that is a man who is possessed of super-hunger, super-thirst, super-lust, super-passion, super-power of destruction. He reminded Bernard Shaw of Cromwell and Napoleon, though his precise nature was unknown to him. This monster is at the present time the invisible king of the civilized world, determined to leave it empty. He is the modern Duke of Skull, who electrocutes his victims, and maintains

his reputation for Nietzschean nobleness without making use of the barbaric weapons which the Saga perpetually brandished in the air. But his sentiments, the driving forces of life, are essentially those of the Scandinavian Saga. He holds that "life is essentially appropriation, injury, conquest of the weak, suppression, severity, obtrusion of peculiar forms, incorporation, and putting it mildest, exploitation." Until towards the close of the Great War people believed that Wilhelm II of Prussia was the incarnation of this Darwino-Nietzschean dragon. But that illusion has now vanished by the action of the German socialists who circumvented him by the power of combination and compelled him to abdicate. Socialism has come to stay. It has come to save the average man by checking the somersaults of the prancing superman. Master-morality and slave-morality will both disappear leaving human morality to rule the world. This is the mission of socialism, the mission of the workers' union, call it by whatever name, combination, conspiracy, trade-unionism, syndicalism, fabianism, socialism, communism or anarchism.

I shall conclude this chapter by briefly dwelling on the condition of the consumer and his relations to the Duke, in his developed multifurcated character. The consumer holds an enigmatical position among the subjects of the empire of property. He is either native or foreign. But the Duke does not show much discrimination in his behaviour towards them, except when the foreign consumer goes astray and begins to show political preferences.

I say the consumer's position is enigmatical. He is both a stern reality and an abstraction. Everybody is a consumer. The Duke himself is a consumer, and is so far a subject in his own empire. Lenders, borrowers, manufacturers, workers are all subjects of this empire. Yet he is, as a rule, sadly neglected by society, though without him society would be lifeless ; no land would be cultivated, no capital would be used in production ; no workers would be employed in the factories. No person would think of borrowing money.

He pays by far the major part of the tax which enables the State to get on, for taxes are for the most part levied on consumption. These are called indirect taxes, because they are gathered through invisible collectors, and by invisible processes of collection. Yet the consumer is not much thought of as a power in society. If he

consumes lavishly and pays most tax he is stigmatised as a spendthrift. If he consumes little he is called niggardly, miserly and other names. If he is cheated by the collectors he is called stupid. The Duke as landlord showed him no mercy in England when he screamed for cheap bread in the first half of the 19th century. At length his wailings were heard in parliament, and Corn Laws were abolished. Everybody had a self-interest in the matter of food consumption, and everybody was afraid of being called mean and selfish if he pleaded for cheap bread. It might also be suspected that his consuming capacity, even his borrowing capacity was being replaced by the capacity for begging. So the majority remained silent in parliament. The Duke said he would supply the whole of England's food consumption if he had a free hand, and would thus save the country from the dangers inherent in dependence on foreign countries for the necessities of life. He was given a free hand ; and tax upon imports fluctuated miraculously. The price of bread quadrupled itself. At length it was found that the Duke was a humbug. The country could never produce all the wheat that it required, and the population was growing by leaps and bounds. It had nearly trebled in fifty years. So the corn laws were abolished to the chagrin of the Duke, who had nothing more to urge in his favour. In fact, he had gathered much capital during the fifty years, and did not much care. But consider the sufferings of the poor consumers, whose children died by the thousand. These consumers were workers also. They took their children to the factories to be brutified, instead of sending them to the capacious maw of death.

The foreign consumer is an essential factor of civilization. Locomotive engines of all kinds, ships, railways, and aeroplanes are invented because they have their value chiefly in the fact that they help to approach the foreign consumer. The Duke of Skull fondles him with due respect for his comforts and conveniences, and specially his tastes, which he consults with great attention before undertaking a new adventure. He gratuitously brings necessities, comforts and luxuries to his door, and offers them at a price often fabulously low. There is no body in the world for whom he shows greater solicitude, for whose welfare he prays with more serious earnestness and devotion. The truth is the Duke is more ready to reduce costs than to increase prices, to starve the worker at home than to disappoint the foreign consumer, even when he has a monopoly of the markets.

The principle is rigidly and ruthlessly enforced when competition in the market is thought likely to interfere with the affectionate touch which he fondly maintains with him.

He is bitterly jealous of young Dukes coming into prominence from foreign countries in the world's market. But the gods, like women, have a mysterious preference for young men. In this aesthetic sense the foreign consumer is a veritable damsel, a Dulcinea in the best form, a Hellenic Helena, an inspiring force for Homers, ancient and modern, a creatrix of Iliad, a perennial moralizer and enlivener of human nature, which has an innate love of muscular strength and masculine emotions, of jealousy, anger, indignation, revengefulness, vindictiveness, retributive justice, greatness, vileness, monstrousness, war, conquest, brigandage, desolation and destruction, in short, of all that characterises the Superman. The foreign consumer is becoming a real danger to civilization, because supermanishness among the civilized states, monarchical, republican or dictatorial, is marching truculently ahead for ascendancy, leadership, primacy and paramountcy. It is said the consumer living in China is the most attractive person at the present moment to whom all the would-be supermen of the world are paying courtly attention, or sending furtive glances, with the result that political philosophers consider that hapless country to be the centre of tremendously gallant activities in the near future.

The foreign consumer lives in a dependency, a dominion or a sovereign state, weak or strong, martially or politically. She is differently treated in each of these cases when her responsiveness to the Duke's friendly attentions shows an aberrative disposition. In the dependency she is coerced by imperial legislation ; in the dominions she is placated by preferential pacts ; in a strong sovereign State she takes up a broomstick like a termagant, with which she either brings about an honourable compromise, or turns the intruder back, bag and baggage.

Freedom is the slogan of the day. Dependencies rise to dominion status. Dominions rise to sovereign States. In India the Duke imposed excise duty on cotton manufacturers of Bombay when the consumer showed slight signs of economic preference, which the Duke suspected had a strain of pugnacious patriotism. This was in 1895 A.D. In 1906 A.D. the boycott in Bengal received a slap in the face by the doubling of looms and spindles in Lancashire.

Since then political relations have slightly changed. The excise duty has been reduced and abolished, and the Duke who, through foreign competition and other causes, connected with the Great War, has lost his former paramountcy in parliament, is gloomily perplexed by the progress of industries in India, China, Japan, America and other countries. He laments the weakness of his government and is sorely perplexed by the depression of trade, which threatens to destroy him and his civilization.

XII. THE HUNDRED YEARS' CIVIL WAR.

The history of the Duke of Skull would be sadly incomplete without a more graphic account of the war which he has waged with wage-earners during the last hundred years, and which is speedily coming to a crisis. Thrilling incidents, indecisive victories and defeats in skirmishes, flanking movements and tactical manœuvers are not within the scope of this account. I shall deal with general principles, root causes and likely prospects, and shall particularly direct attention to psychological forces which guide the destinies of the belligerents. It is apparently a war between capital and labour, between employer and employee, between profit and wages. But the reality extends further and deeper. It is a war between the rich and the poor, between property and privation, between the will to command and the will to obey, between arrogance and modesty, between wastefulness and thrift, between equality and difference, between mastership and slavery, between righteousness and iniquity, between fraternity and cousinhood, between competition and co-operation, between co-ordinative co-operation and subordinative co-operation, between labour and leisure, between vulgarity and artistic spirituality. In short it is a war in which entire society is concerned, and whose issue will decide the destiny of mankind for centuries to come. In an unindustrialized or fractionally industrialized country the war between capital and labour leaves the majority of the population unconcerned. There are strikes and lockouts taking place in India, but the interest they arouse is extremely limited and local. In a completely industrialised country a general strike is an event which causes universal electrification within the nation, and, where, as in England, the problem of life and death depends upon foreign competition and native co-operation

the interest aroused by strikes and lockouts are worldwide. There was a time when a general strike in Lancashire threatened the world, and particularly the people of India, with nakedness. Lancashire has now lost her paramountcy, and the recent strike left the world cold. But the English people did not feel the same degree of unconcern, and an industrialised people like them could not feel it, even though the majority of the people might have no capital invested nor relatives employed in the cotton industry. Industrialism implies a psychology, a national ideal of life, and a mode of living conformable to that ideal. Industrialism represents a particular type of national culture, and at the present day western civilization and industrial civilization or industrialism are convertible terms. The war between capital and labour, between capitalism and socialism, makes no difference to industrialism. Both parties profess industrialism for the same purpose of life, and appraise it at the same value. The conflict concerns only the method in which industrialism can be pursued with the greatest advantage to the nation. The aim of the civilization is self-preservation, *i.e.*, preservation of the individual self and the national self ; and the process of self-preservation brings as a by-product individual and social progress, which means enhanced fighting power against Nature and Neighbour. Where the self stands in the centre of creation, and the rest of the world is supposed to have value only as a 'masseuse', war is the normal condition of life, and peace is valued as conducive to the promotion of fighting power, and to the preparation for the next war. There is nothing marvellous, therefore, in the hundred years' war on which I intend to dwell a little.

Man is endowed by Nature with individual self-consciousness. Group self-conciousness is created and reared by civilization. Tribal self-consciousness is an instinct residing in the subliminal regions of the mind. Self-consciousness in one place implies the existence in another place of hostile forces, actually or potentially engaged in weakening it, in overpowering it, subduing it, perhaps in extinguishing it. The long-lived self-consciousness of the Duke of Skull thoroughly drilled and trained to guard itself against possible enemies had by the end of the 18th century nearly accomplished the extinction of the self-consciousness of his God-forsaken neighbours as a preventive, self-protective measure. Wage-earners had practically no class self-consciousness until the early decades of the nineteenth century. Circumstances operating

through the centuries had deadened it throughout Europe. The Industrial Revolution, now more appropriately known as Industrialism, dragging behind it the revolution of agriculture, revived widespread group self-consciousness in rural as well as urban tracts. The whole of the lowest strata of British society, the ultimate support of the entire social structure, became suddenly quick with life. It was here that Industrialism, as a new type of civilization, first came into existence and wonderfully developed itself by the nursing care of monopoly and of the science of plutology, which afterwards modestly changed its name to economics. Adam Smith's *magnum opus* was called the "Wealth of Nations". This wealth included labour power. At the same time the name carried in its womb germs of the collectivist idea which has now developed into socialism. Mill called his work "The Principles of Political Economy" which means the principles which make production and distribution of wealth politically or nationalistically economical. It has a flavour of pugnacious patriotism, or nationalism, or developed national self-consciousness. Professor Marshall called his work "The Principles of Economics", as if he wanted to divest the science of its political entanglements. But the work bristles with warlike ideas, such as national assets, national dividends, national income, national property, national rivalry, national leadership and so forth. The collective nationalistic idea, the idea of pugnacious patriotism is ubiquitous in western literature. Even science harbours it. The struggle for existence, celebrated in modern biology, has made that science popular by the conception of perennial universal war, which tingles the querulous instinct in the human heart. No wonder that the science of economics, now recognized as an important branch of psychology, should try to attract popular attention by giving prominence to that aspect of it which is concerned with war, civil as well as foreign. The present chapter briefly deals with civil war in western civilization. I call it the hundred years' war because it has lasted for about a century, and though it has not come to its close yet there are signs which indicate that the end is not far off. Bertrand Russell, without risking his reputation for foresight and prophecy, has made the following oracular deliverance in regard to the future of the war and of western civilization. "Capitalism" says he, "is essentially transitional, the survival of private property in the means of production into the industrial era, which has no place in it owing to the fact that

production has become co-operative. Capitalism by being ill-adapted to industrialism, rouses an opposition which must in the end destroy it. The only question is whether labour will be strong enough to establish socialism upon the ruins of capitalism, or whether capitalism will be able to destroy our whole industrial civilization in the course of the struggle." I may add by way of annotation that war and sexual love being the quintessence of human life, and war being the more vital ingredient in western life, peace will never come, but that the present war will be followed by another, possibly the Hobbesian-Darwinian war of each against all.

The science of economics profoundly conscious of the swamp of misery and the slough of despond in which capitalistic industrialism was rapidly driving the majority of the people, and deeply sympathising with their tribulations, persistently, inconsistently, paradoxically insisted on the policy of *laissez faire*, the policy of indifference, and of non-interference with the ancient, pre-historic, pre-social, and, therefore, venerable system of competition, which had effected creative civilization by destructive methods, on the ground that such interference was paganistic in principle, because it was opposed to the golden law of demand and supply, and the brazen law of wages, and was, therefore, likely to throw society from the frying pan into the fire. The soundness of these laws were questioned by the socialists; and Professor Marshall, in order to hold the latter up to ridicule, divided the philosophers into economists and socialists, on the war-like principle which divides the world into east and west, the western people into Huns and Nordics, mankind into civilized and savage, spiritually disposed men into christians and pagans.

The State being secretly in the pay of the Duke of Skull, though created and maintained for the benefit of all, may with great wisdom, tactfully applied, adopt the policy of non-interference sweetened by polite regrets and sugar-coated infidelism, ascribing inscrutability to the heart of God, who created the aforesaid laws, and inexorably enforced them through His mysterious and indefatigable agent, called 'nature' in science. But the actual sufferers could not complacently return home with this disappointing response from the State, or express satisfaction with the new pragmatic theory of divine orientation. They therefore consulted their educated friends; and the latter assured them that the laws were not divine

enactments, but the outcome of clandestine conspiracy between the State and private property. These friends of the poor and helpless were nicknamed socialists, that is, super-socialists or ultra-socialists, because they were supposed to be in error in thinking that society was capable of advancing indefinitely in the direction, prescribed by the original contract by which society was organized, of moral restraint imposed on the strong, and preservation secured for all. This contract, it was subconsciously affirmed by *laissez faire* politics, was invalidated and stultified by the newly discovered theory of Natural selection and Survival of the fittest. The poor and the weak workers and wage-earners must unconditionally surrender themselves to the capitalist organization.

The disgruntled wage-earners, assembled at meeting, passed three clinching resolutions of stupendous significance, namely, (1) that the theory of Natural selection is either true or false, and (2) that if it is false, the State is bound to help them, and (3) that, if it is true, they will gather the superior strength of combination, and overpower the less strong capitalist, who was therefore bound to go to the wall.

These are the fundamental facts which led to the hundred years' war. The war is still raging. The capitalist has lost salient after salient, and the once helpless wage-earner has gained ground inch by inch, and is fairly on the way to final victory.

It may be objected to this theory of the origination of the war that the law of Natural Selection was discovered in the middle of the 19th century, whereas the war commenced early in that century. The answer is that the law was latent in the subconscious region of the human mind before it found precise formulation in the Darwinian dogma. Hobbes was aware of the struggle for existence. He was probably not clear about the law of the Survival of the fittest. He put an end to the struggle for existence by creating society by contract. Of course, he had in mind the struggle for existence against neighbour only. He had nothing to say regarding the struggle against Nature, which could not be terminated by contract, but only by science and industry. When the struggle for existence became intensely and unprecedentedly acute early in the nineteenth century, wisdom suggested the propriety of a round table conference and the necessity of a new contract drafted and formulated with scientific precision, definiteness and compre-

hensiveness. But this suggestion was not accepted. The policy of *laissez faire* stood in the way ; and the Duke of Skull was inflexible, implacable, intractable, inexorable. He felt insulted by the proposal for compromise, and declared his resolution to fight to the last drop of blood. He declared that his behaviour towards his employees was generous, and left nothing to be desired ; and that if the latter suffered so much, society should try to soften the tyranny of Nature which intensified the struggle for existence. He generously offered pecuniary help for research work and for scientific inventions. It must be admitted that there is much truth in what the Duke said about the struggle against Nature. The forces of capitalism, it is true, are joining those of Nature to crush the labourer and it is difficult to say which of the two forces are most to blame for the sufferings of the poor. At the same time it would be ridiculous to praise the Duke for generosity in offering help for scientific research. He is more interested in such research than the labourer. Research and invention have been unremitting throughout these hundred years, and the total production of wealth has increased a thousand fold, perversely and paradoxically counterbalanced by discontent among the people which has increased in geometrical progression.

The policy of *laissez faire* secured by him enabled the noble Duke to treat the wage-earners as free slaves. The new system may be called free-slavery, which means freedom added to slavery, because part of the legitimate wage, instead of being paid in the currency of the country, was paid in the shape of freedom extending over six or seven hours of the night out of the 24 hours of the day. Interpreted in industrial terms this meant an enormous gain of national wealth. The freedom was spurious and meaningless, being limited to the hours of rest which Nature's tyranny exacts as an unevadable tribute. When this kind of gain to national wealth was mentioned by economists they undeniably excluded from the denotation of the term 'nation' a good moiety of the population. The retainers of the Duke of Skull are staunch nationalists of limited vision. The truth of this criticism took a long time to reveal itself. The wage-earners may be mere mercenaries in the factory, but they are true nationalists in the barrack, and in the estimation of the conscript sergeant. Their number and health has now come to be regarded as national assets, and Factory Acts have generally a hygienic principle underlying them. The State cannot afford to be

indifferent to the physical health of the men, the moral health of their women, and both kinds of health of their children, the next generation of producers, reproducers and defenders of the nation. The fact that the life of the nation extends beyond the life of the present generation is a fundamental fact associated with the ideal of industrialism, and therefore with its methods of behaviour towards neighbour. Workers ask for higher wages, and Factory Acts, in answer, make provision for better health for themselves, and primary education for their children. Their nationalistic value is given a higher place than their value as individuals. They are collectively good national assets, and unreliable as individuals. They are good nationalists, but bad individuals. These are the ideas that guide behaviour in the ruling classes towards them. They are very serviceable for society, but they have the bad habit of eating bread soaked in sweat, which emit a bad smell, and make them unclean and uncompanionable. One has not the hardihood to tell them, "*Nikal jao*". One has not the heart to say, "Come in please," or to shake hands with them. They are ethiopian images of God painted white, and while one can love them or revere them, one cannot share one's table or bed with them. This psychology of the aristocratic heart is now in the melting pot. Labourites now sit on front Treasury benches in the House of Commons. The Cabinet is at their disposal. The Hague, Locarno and Geneva are familiar places to them. They stand before kings ; they also stand before mean men, perhaps because they are more diligent in their calling than Benjamin Franklin, who took pride in standing before kings, but fancied it to be humiliating to stand before mean men.

To return to the question of self-consciousness. The Duke of Skull was a student of history. But history was almost silent on the question of self-consciousness in wage-earners. In the middle ages there were no wage-earners, but slaves, serfs and villeins. Later there were wage-earners, employed in domestic service, in boarding houses and hotels. There were also wage-earners employed in the field. But the entire volume was negligible, and class-self-conciousness was absent. The domestic servant might stick to service to the end, or chuck it off. But there was no general boycott or strike. The truth is wage-earners are a class newly created by Industrialism about a century and a half ago as a counter-part of the capitalists.

The value of the counter-part was seldom correctly appraised. John, James and Harry were wage-earners. None of them was indispensable, because if one or two of them showed sulkiness, substitutes were easily available. When sulkiness became contagious vindictiveness invented the steam engine, which was designed to exterminate the group or brood of vipers by substituting mechanical power for vital power, for beast-power and man-power. But the steam engine paradoxically proved faithful and perfidious at the same time. It performed the major part of the work, but at the same time increased the necessity of man-power. It accomplished an important piece of secret service. It degraded the intelligence, the character and the health of the wage-earner. The noble Duke, though somewhat disappointed by the wickedness of the engine, was thankful for the degradation, which made him secure against the wag-earner's group-consciousness. The latter was reduced to the condition of a helpless beast of burden, and the 'consciousness of kind', which lies behind the organization of society (as discovered by Professor Giddings) was all but dead in him.

At the same time the intelligence and foresight of the Duke failed him when he closely herded the wage-earners together in order to save expense, as well as by the necessity of the situation. Motor-buses were not yet invented, and Professor Marshall had not yet discovered that segregated suburban life was better for national progress than congested town life or tenement life. Congested life, by the opportunity which it afforded for the mutual exchange of ideas during the free hours of the night, roused a reflective 'consciousness of kind' in the heart of the wage-earner, and he cried out in mixed hope and despair, "Evil be thou my good," with attentive response from the proper spiritual quarters.

The group consciousness was necessarily weak and diffident in the incipient stages. It developed slowly because the worker was weak in intelligence, wearied in thought, debilitated in volition, and worried by family affections. Nothing fermented in his stomach or in his brain, and his heart and spinal cord were both broken. He had become an invertebrate animal domesticated by capital. He saved nothing. His wife earned nothing, and his children were street arabs. When the spokesman of the first meeting, at the head of a small deputation, approached the managing director, and muttered "Governor you must give us more wage, or " (he was

was going to say, "or we will strike"), the latter interrupted him with a dreadful glare of his eyes, and said, "Or what ?". The churl, who had for the moment lost all his wits, softly and slowly replied "Or, we shall work as now."

Women are by nature slow to acquire group self-consciousness, and children are too young to acquire it, except on the play ground, where it has no stability. They are also less expensive to employers. They came as windfall into the factory and remained there as a permanent acquisition secured by arduous efforts at enormous cost. Women are supposed to have a lower standard of work-power than men, and they are still allowed a lower standard of wages. The work-power of children is supposed to be inferior to that of their mothers. The introduction of women and children thus gave a tremendous advantage to Industrialism. The productive capacity of men-workers was also supplemented by the reproductive capacity of women workers, and it is a serious question whether a woman-worker's reproductive power has not contributed more to the progress of industrial civilization than her productive power. It may be even questioned whether on the whole women-workers cannot claim a higher place than men-workers for their contribution to that civilization.

How did woman come to be introduced to factory work ? A woman can cook, sew or sweep, and help in the farmer's dairy or barn yard. But factory work is of a different kind. It will be interesting to trace the history of this phenomenon.

James, a good worker, saw the managing director by appointment, and told him that he was suffering from a hard lot, which had given him a fruitful wife and a number of unmanageable children, so that he was unable to make two ends meet. The director spent a minute on reflection, and then said with some diffidence, "You may bring your wife and children into the factory and I shall give them some light work to do, and if they give satisfaction I shall give them enough remuneration to help you out of the difficulties. I do not like a good operative like you should be left to waste his life and opportunities in brooding over his misfortune. It will be only to help you that I propose to try the experiment." James next morning loyally took his wife and children to the factory, and the director was good enough to give them work. James felt greatly relieved by the director's kindness, but neither of them

knew at the time that the acorn would grow into the oak for good or evil. The Duke of Skull's Lancashire property soon commanded the wonder and admiration of the world. Mother Eve had taken to spinning on a large scale by the side of father Adam, who delved and sweated for bread in the factory, while their children were broken to honest and useful work before it was too late, *i.e.*, before they became larrikins and street arabs. The experiment brought relief to wayfarers, fathers, manufacturers and to the people at large. But the future was fraught with national danger, with which I shall deal in its proper place. Suffice it to say that boys and girls who were brought from the streets into the factory have now been sent into schools ; and women who went from the hearth now eat their bread in hotels and restaurants and figure prominently in polling booths, where they show great class-self-consciousness, and threaten the Duke with expulsion from the Cabinet. They sit in the galleries of the House of Commons with the Duchess and cut at her cost jokes with which she bears in silence. Well may James cry out "Evil be thou my good". The Duke may heave a sigh and say, "the devil accustomed to take the hindmost has now extended his prehensile limbs into the foremost."

In theory rulership is now divorced from proprietorship. In England rulership having belonged for centuries to the aristocracy came to be divided between them and the middle class. The working class has now been added, and the tendency is towards a growing influence of the last class, and when this influence has risen beyond given limits, proprietorship will be a separable accident of rulership, instead of being the dominant factor in the government of the country or the empire. At present representatives of the working class are in charge of the government. They form the ministry with a larger number of supporters than either the conservatives or the liberals.

People often wonder how the workers of England have acquired the tremendous self-consciousness which have enabled them to turn rulership from an inseparable to a separable accident of proprietorship, an oligarchy into a true democracy, and the term ruling class into a solecism. The Duke of Skull is heavily responsible for this disintegration of the empire of property, the empire of the few over the many.

The employees in a manufacturing concern are divided into the literate and the illiterate. The standard of life in the literate

classes is much higher than in the illiterate classes, and members of the higher classes necessarily require higher income. But the supply of literate labour being heavily in excess of the demand, the Duke at an unhappy moment thought of taking practical advantage of the fact by reducing the wages of the lower grade clerks to the level of those of the higher grade operatives. He failed to see that the equality of wages would create a monstrous fraternity, that the grievances of either class would be ventilated by both, and that ultimately Industrialism might be altogether divorced from private property, or, in other words, that the empire of private property might be replaced by socialism.

The clerks belonging to the middle class families had friends and relatives on the pulpit, the platform and the press ; and an extended, though indefinite, class-consciousness is roused into vocality when the interests of either clerks or operatives are affected by any innovation ; and if the majority of the entire population of the country is not roused to action in every case it is because the classification of society according to interest is extremely ramified and complicated by congruences, partial congruences and partial collisions.

The middle class, lying between the rich and the poor, function as a bridge over the gulf that separates them. But the bridge is of the pontoon type, which can be opened or closed at short notice. The middle class is a disjunctive as well as a conjunctive force in society. It is through this class that the top layers of society are replenished from the lower layers when contraceptive forces denude the former. It is through this class that the rich rule the poor, and it is through this class that the poor over-rule the rich.

It is somewhat vulgarly supposed even by learned men that the bourgeoisie support the proletariat in their social ambitions out of pure altruistic feelings. The error is owing to the confusion which extended knowledge and foresight create between egoism and altruism, by expanding the interests of the individual over the community to which he is particularly attached. The communal self is only an expanded form of the individual self. Where the consciousness of kind is strong between two persons they, for certain practical purposes, constitute a single person, a sort of metaphysical ego. The love which they show to each other is virtually self-love, and the exchange of beneficence between them is egoistic in

proportion to the strength of the consciousness of kind existing in their hearts. Complete consciousness of kind is impossible even between twins, to say nothing of simple biogenetic brotherhood. The strength of consciousness of kind between two persons varies, among other things, with unity in the number of interests to which they are attached. The Lancashire and Bombay operatives feel the consciousness of kind in the economic aspect of life only. That consciousness has no bearing on the racial, national, cultural or chromatic aspects of their psychology.

The mother's love for her child stands on a stronger egoistic foundation. The child in the womb is indistinguishable from the mother. After birth the feeling of oneness (or unity) slowly declines until the child is able to take care of himself or herself, and from that point forward the love slowly transforms itself into the altruistic type.

The consciousness of kind between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat chiefly relates to the economic aspects of life. Both classes feel the inadequacy of their income, the precariousness of their earnings, and the natural envy which the security and comforts of the rich arouse in them. There is nothing to be particularly ashamed of in this last feeling, often called a frailty of human nature. But the truth is that this feeling is the strongest element in the consciousness of kind, which exists between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The consciousness of kind between two persons is strengthened by the consciousness of difference between them and a third person.

Mr. Bernard Shaw who hates nothing more than sham indirectly lays great stress on the consciousness of kind, when he presents his credentials to establish his claim to impartiality and sincerity in his militant opinions on the social order. He says he was fairly well-to-do in childhood, suffered the agonies of unemployment for two years in youth, and is now a rich man. He has therefore no particular leanings to any of these three classes. It may be reasonably asked whether the memories of the two years' of unemployment rankle in his heart with a stronger force than his subsequent experiences. Mr. Shaw had never any attachment to snobbery, and is too refined in his taste not to feel that an excess of wealth is not friendly to intellectual and moral health. His outspokenness is often concealed in a cloud of humour, and he is not likely to be

offended by being told that he is not above Giddings' law of consciousness of kind. When he speaks of socialism as contrasted with capitalism one feels the will to believe spontaneously welling in one's heart, however strong may have been the influence of the consciousness of kind in the formulation of his opinion.

Group-consciousness among factory workers has also been substantially helped by state action, direct and indirect. The several Combination Acts, whether favourable or unfavourable to the workers, by giving prominence to their collective interests as contrasted with their individual interests, were a valuable intimation of the importance which the government attached to group-consciousness, and of the panic which it roused in the heart of capitalism. When they asked for bread the government gave the workers hospitals, play grounds and open air.

The force of the consciousness of kind as the instrument of unification or combination among men, and of the creation of group-self-consciousness among them seldom attains its full stature until the higher force of the consciousness of unkindness has taken definite shape. Love becomes vertebrate only when Hate has decided whom to oppose or resist, and with what fighting force. A man that has none to hate has none to love. Also he that hates most loves most. Co-operation directly varies in strength and solidarity with competition.

Group-life is impossible without enemies to fight. Love and strife are the organizing forces of society, and of these two, strife is the more vital and more virile. Hate is the source from which springs love, and Hate is its principal guide.

That 'he that is not with us is against us' is a truism that enables us to determine where to seek for friends, and what to expect from them and how much to give them in return, for man lives a bartering life, no matter at what stage of civilization he stands. This principle is most forcibly illustrated by the political phenomenon which made it possible for the working class to take their due share in the working of the government of England. The Reform Act of 1832 had transferred power from the aristocracy to the middle class. The middle class having acquired power tenaciously stuck to it. They discovered that both the rich and the poor, the very realities of the social organization, were against them

They even discovered that the poor were worse than the rich, that pure oligarchy was better than democracy. The aristocracy on their part knew that the middle class were inwardly hostile to the poor. They discovered also that by themselves they were not strong enough to oust the middle class. They therefore sought friendship with the poor working class, and introduced the Reform Act of 1867. They felt in the subconscious region of their hearts that the new friendship was unstable, and might prove dangerous to them and to the nation at large, but the vitality of hate for the middle class trampled upon every obstacle. We now know that in extinguishing the middle class in the political arena, the aristocracy have extinguished their own power, and are in danger of losing the very source of power, namely, private property. Nationalization of wealth is now a question of time.

As another apt illustration I may refer to the political phenomenon which transferred rulership in Bengal from the followers of the Prophet to those of the Messiah. The aristocracy of Bengal extinguished itself in the midnight conspiracy at the mansion of the Seth family of Murshidabad.

What is known as the balance of power is the product of the search for superior strength to extinguish the enemy of the hour.

The French helped the Americans in 1784 because they considered that the English were against them.

Entire history bristles with illustrations to prove the soundness of the theory that Hate is the parent of Love and its guide. The organization of society was possible because Hate brought forth Love. Two tribes together destroyed a third, and transformed themselves into a tribe of double power and property. This process has gone on for ages. It was only recently that the theory of self-determination turned it backward, and created dispersive multiplicity out of inchoate unity.

Property and political power still largely adhere to each other, but the thin end of the wedge has been inserted between them and the final disruption is not far off.

The bearing of party government on the conflict between property and poverty is obscured by the fact that the opposition of parties is founded upon trifles of momentary interest, which try

without success to assimilate principles of deeper interest. Toryism and Whiggism, conservatism and liberalism, individualism and collectivism, unionism and separatism, imperialism and little Englandism, and so forth, imply oppositions of very large dimensions based upon passing emotions illogically trying to grow by tortuous intellectual assimilation. The result is that the extreme wings of the parties never count, and the country is ruled by men in whose convictions the opposition has no real existence, *i.e.*, by men who intellectually live on the border land and who are neither caledonians nor cockneys, neither Scotsmen nor Englishmen but plain Britishers at heart, which is cleverly concealed for party purposes by deceitfully honest professions or rhetorical equivocations. The working class in their ambition have been in turn helped and hindered by each of the parties, *i.e.*, by tories and whigs, by conservatives and liberals, by individualists and collectivists. Professor Dicey has made a supreme effort to clear up the paradox, but seems to have failed because he ignored the bearing of Hate upon the problem, and vainly tried to ascribe to generosity what truly belongs to selfishness. The confusion between the group-self and the individual-self, or between group-selves of different types produce a confusion between generosity and self interest, between altruism and egoism.

THE SECOND EMPIRE : THE EMPIRE OF MASCULINITY.

General Outlook.

This empire may be called the empire of sex, though in the English language sex, in its special sense, means the fair sex, as contrasted with the other sex, subconsciously characterised by moral unfairness. It is in a manner a branch of the empire of property, for woman has for ages been regarded as property, as an apparatus for the production of live-stock or muscular wealth, commonly known as labour, which helps in the production of wealth in its common sense. The Duke of Skull is not very fond of children in his own family, but wants them for expanding and exalting his empire, and when he found that the male children were not adequate for the work he put their mothers into the factories. This is the history of woman labour in Industrialism. The real woman, the womanly woman, is the woman in labour.

The reproductive process, the supposed real and universal function of woman, is attended with pleasure both to herself and to the man who employs her. The last pleasure bestows an additional value on woman, but in the final appraisement her own pleasure in the process is taken as a payment of high value, made in kind on the truck system for the service she gives in the domestic concerns of life, such as cooking, sweeping, house-keeping and so forth. I shall presently show that this part of her wages in the economy of life is automatically and steadily losing in real value, and that this growing reduction in the value of her wages is the real cause of the new social phenomenon known as *Feminism* in Western civilization, which is rapidly undermining the Empire of Masculinity.

Confusion of ideas is inevitable where artificial relations are identified with natural relations, and the two are mixed up as if they were one. The relationship between man and woman created by the idea of motherhood is natural. Wifehood is an artificial conventional creation. Motherhood is an immutable everlasting function. Wifehood is an artificial function, liable to change, even to abolition. The institution of wifehood has been changing in colour and form, for centuries, and is now ramshackle in the civilized world, particularly among the cultured classes of society. Feminism is nothing but a process by which the artificial relations between man and woman, which have existed for ages are now finding a new orientation in the direction of their natural realities. Femenism aims at dispelling illusions which originated in primitive times, when the reflective power of man was in a rudimentary condition, but which have persisted through the influence of one-sided stupefying self-interest. In this new movement man and woman are alike interested, and its progress has been tremendous during the last fifty years. The artificial, confused valuation of woman as part of humanity was the result of impulse untouched by reason, or by a negligible amount of it. The new valuation which is wrought by reason, with a slight admixture of emotion, lies at the bottom of the forces, which are breaking up this ancient empire.

The opinion that the empire of sex is a branch of the empire of property is reinforced by the fact that the break-up of the latter empire is inevitably leading to the break up of the former.

Feminism seems to be an inseparable concomitant of socialism. The insurgences of worker and woman have been simultaneous and mutually helpful. The spread of education, a most important phenmenon of human history, has produced self-consciousness in both at the same time ; and both are engaged in shaking off the illusions, which have oppressed them for ages, with growing acceleration. I may note in passing, that religious superstition and the hypnotism of racial difference are declining with these illusions, so that the entire social system is giving way to a new order or disorder, no body can yet say, which.

The empire of sex means the power which man possesses over woman as mother, wife (friend), sister and daughter, and ultimately as woman, and over her sex collectively. As mother she is cast out in old age, when she is most in need of help. As wife she is discarded when she fails or refuses to submit to his desires. As sister she is asked to look about for herself. As daughter she is sacrificed when opulent rascality presents itself for connection. Feminism aims at giving her independence and free choice in accepting friendship (wifehood) or motherhood or a life of single blessedness, to restore her to her place in humanity.

OUTLINE OF HISTORY.

It is affirmed by some philosophers that at a remote period in the past woman ruled over man. In the matriarchate woman was polyandrous. The patriarchate followed, and man became polygamous. The general prevalence of polyandry implies a majority of male, and a minority of female, population. Woman was the queen when she was sought for by the pressure of competition among men who wanted gratification for the sex appetite. Her dignity was enhanced in proportion to the frequency of disappointment suffered by supplicants. This was reversed in the patriarchal age. It may be guessed that woman lost her queenship by the caprice of nature, which turned a minor female population into a majority. Tribal wars which may be supposed to have begun in the transitional period, hastened the transformation by the accession of women in large numbers from the vanquished

tribes, for it is said with humour mixed with truth that the conquerors in tribal wars made slaves of the vanquished men, and wives of their women (Gardiner's History of England). We may guess also that the hope of this booty was the primary incentive to tribal wars, in which women evidently took no part, and success caused the fall of woman with growing acceleration from queenship to abject subjection. Human Art reinforced Nature to make this subjection complete, and tö turn woman into mere property. The ultimate object of Feminism at the present day is to turn back woman from property into humanity.

Woman having fallen to the bottom of the abyss of debasement, and lived as a slave for several thousand years began again to rise through causes which sprung into existence afterwards, and developed with the growth of civilization. Her rise was slow until the middle of the nineteenth century, when suddenly new forces, invaded all the four empires. Some of these new forces are tersely represented as Feminism, a movement which includes members from both sexes of the cultured classes, back numbers only being rejected as inadmissible.

The chief cause which raised woman again was the cessation of tribal wars, which, as already indicated, have for their primary object the acquisition of new women for the benefit of the conquering hordes, and which ceased when all the tribes belonging to the same race, speaking the same language, worshipping the same gods, and having in general the same mode of living were consolidated by conquest into a single group, divided from other groups by natural obstacles, such as hills, large rivers and seas and particucularly impenetrable forests. The real dividing line between these groups were however of a moral nature. They had different colours in their skins, different forms in their heads and faces, different fibre value in their hairs and so forth, and spoke different languages, worshipped different gods and had different modes of life with the result that every group had moral aversion to neighbouring groups, specially to their women, who are constituted by nature to be either objects of love, or objects of deep aversion. This aversion deprived primitive wars of their chief motif and attraction, and peace became common. Continued peace turned man's attention from strife to love. The new age was an age of love. Man began to cherish the aesthetic ideal, and found supreme beauty in the face and form

and youth of woman, colour being uniform on the racial skin. Romanticism largely displaced the idea of property and worship in the relation of the sexes, at least in form. The value of woman, in some respects, rose in the estimation of man, and bestiality was supplemented, but not supplanted, by the appreciation of beauty. The growth of aestheticism and appreciation of feminine beauty revived war of a new form, and for a new purpose. This war was based upon the distinction of beauty and ugliness in women, whereas the old tribal war aimed at the acquisition of women as distinguished from men. Epic poems and novels at the present day deal with the new kind of war, with necessary diversities in the mode of fighting.

The Iliad and the Ramayana deal with wars caused by the aesthetic appetite. The Mahabharata mixes up beauty with property as the causes of the war, which Lord Krishna had come from celestial heights to fight for the regeneration of man. Darwin has given scientific interpretation to this divine intervention by his law of sexual selection and struggle for existence, leading to the survival of the fittest and to the progress of civilization. Sexual selection is synonymous with the aesthetic, and struggle for existence with the acquisitive, passion innate in human nature and developed by culture.

In the patristic age the unmarried Father had a sincere dread of the aesthetic passion, at least so far as it related, as its object, to woman whom he regarded as "a cleverly constructed snare by which we are taken even before we suspect the trap." "But the unintelligible solecistic Father made very little impression upon the human, all too human, mind of man, who continued to cultivate the aesthetic tastes, and to crave for sexual beauty and romance, and thereby to exalt the position, and to enhance the value of woman. But the idea of property attached to her seemed inextinguishable until the middle of the last century.

The Prophet illogically denounced the aesthetic arts, while he offered as the best reward for devotion to the service of God, particularly in propagandist war, *houris* in heaven, who would bring eternal bliss to those who sacrificed themselves for the triumph and glory of God. His followers have generally shown preference for the *houris* of heaven over the rectitude which disparages fine arts.

Professor Giddings has discovered three types of domesticity, namely, (1) the religious proprietary family, (2) the romantic family (3) the ethical family, placed in order of time. A mixture of all the three types has existed for many centuries, in most of the civilized countries. The mixture has varied so as gradually to approach the last type.

LIKENESS AND DIFFERENCE.

Is woman like or unlike man? Is one man like or unlike another? The answers to these two questions are congruent except for the fact that the structure of the reproductive organ of woman is different from that of man. Bone and blood, nerves and tissues, exist in both sexes, and so do intellect, emotions and will. Life is maintained by the same process in both. The desires and appetites are also present in them. But the sperm cell is different from the germ cell. They show unlikeness in the degree of mobility. Hence it is sometimes supposed that the entire life process is divergent, that the sexes not only digest and assimilate differently, but also think, feel and will differently, and that their desires and appetites, their responsiveness to stimuli, and their ideals and aspirations are divergent, and that therefore their outlooks on life cannot coincide. Man reads the world from left to right, woman reads it from right to left. She has different world views, a different meaning and purpose of life, different views regarding the other world; she requires a different kind of education, a different dress while living, and a different coffin for her corpse. Some men think the sexes complement each other by their contrasts and contradictions, by the antipodal directions of their love and hate, of their approbations and disapprobations, their likes and dislikes, their attractions and aversions; by their 'east and west' notions of good and evil, of right and wrong, of pleasure and pain, of happiness and misery. It is supposed that the primary purpose of life is fundamentally different in the sexes, that the mission of man is to produce and that of woman is to reproduce, and that by the Mosaic law, fortified by the Malthusian law, society lives in the perpetual conflict of defect and excess in production and reproduction, the root principle of misery to which humanity was condemned by divine dispensation, not long after the creation of this speck of

dust in the infinite firmament. It is supposed that the functions of the sexes are different, that woman is home-loving and home-staying, while man loves dangers and adventures abroad, and runs, swims and flies, kills and delves ; and woman cooks, spins and weaves at home ; and lastly, that politics are alien to woman's nature and should be vigorously tabooed. This last point was the centre of discussion when feminism began to show itself conspicuously about half a century ago. Some men thought "Let woman have every thing but freedom, specially freedom to legislate for man, freedom to interfere with his extra-territorial, exta-matrimonial, extra-rational and extra-natural rights, and freedom to appear as rival candidates for employment, and to harden the struggle for existence already too hard to bear."

Some men think that the mission of her life being to multiply, woman should devote the whole of her post-pubescent life to this divine function, the pre-pubescent part being given to training for the fulfilment of the meaning and purpose of her life. The idea of electrocuting her at fortyfive subliminally sleeps beneath this grand theory of feminine life. At that critical age nature whispers to her "thus far and no further ; thou hast fulfilled thy mission, and now depart." Nothing need here be said about natural barrenness, deliberate celibacy, and compulsory spinsterhood. The idle brain is the workshop of the devil, who invents a purpose for the purposeless life. Here lies the origin of feminism according to the orthodox opinion.

As a rule woman is misjudged because man shows no explicit discrimination between young women, middle-aged women and old women in judging her. He shows no discrimination between her innate nature and her second nature ; between what God made her and what man has made of her. Man's own second nature makes him think it natural that woman should be consciously hanged first, and then subconsciously given a bad name ; that she should be tortured into weakness, trained in vileness, and stupefied into idiocy and neurasthenia, and then hurled headlong into hell as a biologically weak, biblically wicked and medically idiotic creature. In short, it is righteous for man to make her life purposeless and then call her an "old woman," which means a woman who having lost her creative power is compelled to adopt a wasteful destructive tone of life, and in whose hands nothing ever thrives,

and "everything goes contrary," as illustrated by the life of Mrs. Gummidge, a social reality in David Copperfield. Reason suggests that society should so adjust its affairs that woman's creative worth may continue to the end of her life so that she may never become an "old woman". But society is pursuing precisely the opposite course, and the mission of feminism is to readjust it, to reconstruct it, to remodel it so as to eliminate "old women" from the equation of social life. Nothing disgusts it more than the existence of old women in society ; and nothing exasperates it more than the arrogance of "old women," particularly of the masculine sex, who form the back numbers of the leaders of orthodox society. It is a most remarkable fact that while in domestic life no love is lost between the old women of the two sexes, they present a united front in opposing the new movement.

Quantitative calculation of psychic faculties as a whole is impossible, because among other reasons, these faculties are not of one kind, and each kind requires a separate unit. Again the unit may relate to vigour, ardour, fineness, durability, mutability, mobility, responsiveness to stimuli of various kinds. The task is so difficult that science does not consider itself ripe enough to contemplate the possibility of making a start in research, to say nothing of accomplishing it. Even physical faculties transcend the power of science to discover a unit, because these faculties too are not of one kind. Nerve power and muscular power are different. Horse power is an unscientific unit in the calculation of muscular power. It does not represent the power of horses in general, of the normal horse or of the average horse ; and there are horses of various kinds drawn from various localities scattered over the world. No unit of nerve power has yet been discovered, while the relations of the nerve system and the psychic faculties are only very vaguely and diffidently apprehended. Psychology is yet in embryo, and physiology is in its childhood at best .

But common sense is supposed to have the privilege of rushing in where science fears to tread ; and common sense, it is supposed, is able to give us fairly accurate impressions of the comparative value of the qualities, physical, intellectual and moral, of men and women. Common sense even scoffs at science as good for discovering theories, but worthless for practical life. But common sense has the undesirable habit of introducing into objective observations,

a large subjective element which makes them true only for those who hold the impression, or make the calculations. When we generalise these impressions to apply them to a whole sex we are deliberately unscientific, and diabolically biassed. Common sense has also the weakness of melting into nonsense at the high temperature of controversy. Yet for thousands of years woman, a full moiety of mankind, has been by the verdict of this judge, condemned *en masse*, penalised, punished, imprisoned, chained, throttled, threatened, tortured, tormented as if she was created for eternal perdition, that is to say, for as long as the race continues to exist.

Sexology is not yet a science. Experiments are all but impossible. Observations are not only rare but vitiated by subjective affections. Reports of observations are obscured by the tyranny of words, as well as by the desire to keep within the bounds of decency. Secretiveness is encouraged by social conventions and public opinion, by established custom and the prejudice of tradition. Feminism having disregarded some of its hypotheses, sexology has wantonly assumed a revengeful attitude and is trying to discredit the movement in ways which are likely to retard its own progress as a science. Allowance can be made for honest personal equation, but when politics enters into the discussion, and what ought to be is confused with what is, the resulting fruits of research become deceptive and mischievous and not merely worthless.

Courtship is a failure specially when it springs out of love at first sight. The facts observed with the spectacles of predisposition, are manifestations of an improvised nature, not of innate nature, nor even of second nature. The annals of disappointment in courtship are dangerous instruments at the disposal of the research student. It will be a long time before sexology can emerge out of the slough of custom, prejudice, predisposition, false manners and false morals, innate bias and created wrongheadedness and stubbornness. The following quotation from Dr. Bloch's 'Sexual Life in Modern Time' requires no detailed comment after what has been said above :—
"In the striking difference between the sperm cell of the male and the germ cell of the female we must seek for the ultimate cause of the profound difference between the sexes. Those who maintain the theory of the absolute identity of man and woman must continually be reminded of this fact. Unquestionably the greater mobility of the male reproductive cell as compared with the more

passive quality of the female cell implies the existence of deeply founded psychical differences ; and the existence of these may be assumed with more confidence since we know from experience to what a high degree the finest psychical peculiarities of father and mother can be transmitted by inheritance to the child."

This tremendous assumption is founded upon the simple fact that in meeting each other half way the sperm cell travels a longer distance than the germ cell. It takes no account of the fact relating to etiquette that the host should meet the guest at the gate, and should not betray any flutter of emotion at the visit. That would be undignified, and would give to the visitor an impression of the host's social inferiority. We know nothing of the subsequent activities of the two cells by which they lose themselves in, and sacrifice themselves to, a third personality, which gradually grows into the child. Which is the stronger and more active of the two remains undecided, supposing that the process of union resembles a duel. If it is the embrace of love, we have no reason to think that the germ cell shows any lack of earnestness or enthusiasm, any emotional weakness such as indifference, or dullness, or disgust or peevishness. I need hardly say that the sperm is never allowed admittance without due notice, or a card sent in advance according to civilized etiquette. Mere knocking is not enough. It is rather annoying. Kneeling, wooing, presents or promises are insisted upon. Every circumstance tends to show that psychic differences, if any exist, between the sperm and the germ, are in favour of the latter who shows a high sense of rectitude and unaggressiveness, of self-respect and personal dignity and a due sense of hospitality and love on the one hand and an equal vigour, valour, tact and manoeuvre on the other, which enable her to carry the fight to finish. The writer seems to think as if the sperm marched in, fought, conquered, subdued and annihilated the queen, and marched out in triumph, like an army of the prophet in the early centuries of propaganda work. It will appear from the brief comment that the writer has built a pyramidal conclusion upon a microscopic dot of fact, nine parts of which are assumed, not observed. The comparative passivity of the germ cell is perhaps assumed from the commonplace notion that woman is passive in receiving the advances, the first courtesies of a lover. But Bernard Shaw has once for all dispelled this illusion. He says :—"It is assumed that woman must wait, motionless until she is wooed. Nay, she often does wait

motionless. That is how the spider waits for the fly. But the spider spins her web. And if the fly, like my hero, shows strength that promises to extricate him, how swiftly does she abandon her pretence of passiveness, and openly fling coil after coil about him until he is secured for ever" (Man and Superman p. 19).

The minatory attitude of Dr. Bloch towards those who would identify the sexes is undignified and irrelevant, if meant for feminists, and gratuitously chauvinistic if meant for sexologists. The last clause of the passage is obscure and seems out of place. The law of heredity leaves the question of sex determination untouched.

Lastly the precise nature of the sperm in relation to the body, and its assimilative functions and the environments in which it thrives and lives, has not yet been scientifically discovered. But this much is certain that the sperm cell is not a miniature of the structure of the male body, and that it changes from moment to moment much more rapidly than the latter structure. Admitting the law of heredity the psychic character of the child, male or female, is determined by the ensemble existing at the moment of union between the cells. The law of heredity will have very little practical value for science, until it is able to discover the precise qualities of the sperm and the germ, of the male and female organisms, at the moment when the union and the collapse of the cells take place. The law is further vitiated by other facts, *e.g.*, the saltatoriness which characterises the transmission of qualities in the shape of atavism. The entire law is in a too nebulous condition to frighten those who wish to identify the sexes for feministic purposes.

A more acceptable view of feminism is given by George Hirth :— 'Among all the higher activities and movements of the time, the struggle of our sisters to obtain a position of equality with the strong, the dominant, the oppressive sex, appears to me from the purely human point of view, most beautiful and most interesting, indeed, I regard it as possible that the coming century will obtain its historical characterisation, not from any social or economical controversies of the world of men, but that this century will be known to subsequent history distinctively as that in which the solution of the 'woman's question' was obtained."

This does not commit the writer to any opinion regarding the precise nature of the solution, but welcomes the movement as

calculated to settle for some centuries at least the principles which should guide the mutual behaviour of the sexes so as to bring peace and prosperity to society, and generally advance the cause of civilization

Huxley's attitude to the movement is of a more pugnacious type. He was nothing if not an intellectual gladiator. He says :— "Let us have sweet girl graduates by all means. They will be none the less sweet for a little wisdom; and the golden hair will not curl less gracefully outside the head by reason of there being brains within. Nay if obvious practical difficulties can be overcome, let those women who feel inclined to do so descend into the gladiatorial arena of life not merely in the guise of retiariae, as heretofore, but as bold sicariae, breasting the open fray. Let them, if they so please, become merchants, barristers, politicians. Let them have a fair field ; but let them understand, as the necessary correlative, that they are to have no favour. Let Nature alone sit high above the lists, rain influence and judge the prize."

As an advocate of reasonable freedom, Huxley without enthusiastically welcoming the new movement, neither opposes it nor turns his back upon it. And while he is doubtful as to its ultimate success, and somewhat apprehensive that women will make their position worse in society, he considers that the experiment is worth trying. Few men are satisfied with the existing order, while many are doubtful as to the meliorativeness of the proposed order.

It will appear that both Hirth and Huxley, while committing themselves to no definite expression of opinion regarding the relative survival power of the sexes, incline to the view that civilized woman is somewhat weaker than man in their present state. But they express no clear opinion as to whether nature or civilization is responsible for this weakness, and if they are both responsible, as to how the responsibility is to be apportioned between them. General medical opinion tends to show that while civilization has to some extent weakened woman, it has done nothing to strengthen man. This is a serious charge against civilization, and if woman now desires to add an inch to her stature, no reasonable man can complain.

As to how long the feminist experiment will take to bring matters to a settled condition, Hirth expects a century will be enough. Huxley gives no opinion on this important point, though his proviso regarding "fair field and no favour" would seem to lose its

value without it. At the end of the fair fighting woman must either be strong enough to hold her own or succumb to fate. At what stage of warfare will the renewal of foul play on the part of man become justifiable? An intellectual gladiator himself, Huxley conjures up a new amusement in the social amphitheatre in the shape of a sexual fight, forgetful of the fact that long before either party receives the final blow, the last straw on the back of the camel, it will be the interest of the other to make peace. I may add here that at the end of the great war the allies did not contemplate the extermination of the vanquished Germans, but only their humiliation. They were not inspired by generosity, but by self-interest. In its sincere sober moments civilization never cares for credit for generosity. Camouflage is resorted to in moments of aberration, and camouflage deceives no civilized man though great alliances are maintained by its soothing power. Repressed by the selective extravagance of nature, internal as well as external, civilized man cannot afford to be generous, cannot even always afford to be fair at play, far from showing any favour, to his neighbour, his rival fellow candidate for survival, his antagonist.

THE WOMAN QUESTION.

The essay, "Emancipation-Black and White" in which the passage reproduced in the last section occurs, was written by Huxley in 1865 A.D. when the American Civil War, by its glorious termination, had just emancipated the black slave ; and the question of the emancipation of white slaves, of both sexes, was just beginning to be discussed in the civilized world under the names of the 'labour problem' and ' the woman question.' These have now developed into socialism and feminism with their correlates, capitalism and masculinism. Huxley lived long enough to have the ooportunity of observing for a quarter of a century the early stages of their development, and it is somewhat disappointing that he did not leave to the world the light of his final opinion on the woman question, though he gave one on the labour problem in an essay entitled "Social diseases and worse remedies" written in 1891 A.D. It is disappointing particularly because, during the interval, things had happened which warranted some orientation, at least some

further explanation of the somewhat indifferent and meticulously inconclusive opinion, conceived in a patronising mood, and brought forth with a lofty tone of disinterestedness in 1865. It is to be added, however, in fairness, that though considerable progress had been made by both movements before his death, the astounding developments and achievements of the 20th. century were yet in embryo. The possibilities of the collectivist operations which led to them were yet but vaguely anticipated. Perhaps even the unorthographical, heretical name, feminism, traceable to restless activism was not yet invented. The history of the Quadruple Empire, as developed during the last fifty years, presents phenomena to which it is impossible to find any parallel in its history of the centuries that preceded them. Briefly speaking, white salvery of men has been transfigured into tyranny of labour. The empire of sex has been transformed into harassing domestic tyranny. The empire of supernature is in rapid decadence. The empire of race over race is tottering by its own internal violence; for, kindred races fighting for leadership have created new interests, which make friendship with inferior races more useful than tyranny. The old tyrants of the quadruple empire are feeling the necessity of defensive operations more than finding wisdom in continued aggressiveness. And philosophers ask in amazement, what is the real mission of western civilization? Has it come to uphold or destroy this quadruple empire, *i. e.*, society. Has it come to elevete the world to a higher plane or to rebarbarise it?

There was nothing in the atmosphere of Huxley's generation to indicate the coming approach of the great war, and its desolative, destructive violence, and we are able to read without emotion such equivocal, obfuscating, inconsequential conclusions as the following :—"And the result? For our parts, though loth to prophesy, we believe it will be that of other emancipations. Women will find their place, and it will neither be that in which they have been held, nor that to which some of them aspire. The big chests, the massive brains, the vigorous muscles, and stout frames of the best men will carry the day whenever it is worth their while to contest the prizes of life with the best women."

Huxley finds it hard, inspite of his generous nature and high culture, to hide the idea that women, while forming an integral part of humanity and of human society, are not exactly human in

the sense in which men are so. Suppose the best women for two or three generations fail to beat the best men in winning the first prizes, what then? Would their failure prove that they are permanently incapable of winning them? What are the prizes? Are they physical or psychical? Has it been proved that the fineness of intellect depends upon the mass of brain? Huxley himself discovered in 1854 that the porpoise has a brain nearly as large as that of man (Spencer's Facts and Comments p. 25). Will women be able to obtain some of the prizes that are next in the scale of values? What will be the position of the worst women relatively to the worst men? Suppose the value of all human beings were appraised one by one, in every branch of human quality, would women form a solid block in the list, or will they be scattered over the whole gradation list? Will the co-educational university of social life prepare two separate lists of successful candidates, or one? Does feminism want one list or two? Is the membership of the House of Commons going to be divided between men and women in proportion to their respective population? Are the electorates intended to be communally divided between the sexes? Are the ministers to be selected on the sexual basis? Are the professions and the public services going to be apportioned between the sexes, some of them being reserved for men and the rest transferred to women? Is a form of dyarchy going to be introduced into the state? Huxley seems to admit that the present apportionment of functions between domestic and extra-domestic, will not be retained by the final settlement of the woman question. Things are better handled and managed with greater decision of character in India. The Hindus read from left to right, the Mussalmans from right to left. The Hindus shave their faces, the Mussalmans shave their scalps. The Hindus wear long dhutis, the Mussalmans wear short ones. The Hindus eat garlick, the Mussalmans prefer onions. The Hindus sacrifice goats, the Mussalmans prefer camels and cows and she-goats. The Hindus pray with their faces turned to the east, the Mussalmans pray with their faces turned to the west. Therefore they must be ruled communally and selected Sectionally for the public service on the same principle.

The name given to the essay, *viz.*, "Emancipation-Black and White" seems to be a deliberate insult, offered to white women, made worse by the mood of patronage which underlies it. It contemplates the existing position of white women as identical with

that of Negro slaves. The series of parallelism by which this view is upheld are out of harmony with reality. The reference to the 'fair field and no favour' in relation to both is intended to indicate equal helplessness and dependence. He says "The highest places in the hierarchy of civilization will assuredly not be within reach of his dusky cousins," and the "highest prizes of life will never be awarded to women." He justifies the emancipation of the Negro as an act by which his master transferred his share of responsibility to Nature. The emancipation of white women will, while not improving their condition, leave them none to thank but themselves and nature.

In contemplating the future of emancipated women Huxley refers with sarcastic sorrowfulness to the misfortune which will overtake her in the shape of stouter sons who will more completely knock down their helpless sisters. "Better mothers" he says "will bring forth better sons and the impetus gained by the one sex will be transmitted in the next generation to the other." It seems to be forgotten that better sons will have to face better sisters under the same law of heredity, which will maintain a constant relation in respect of fighting power between the sexes. This sarcastic prognostication has been utterly belied by subsequent events. Women are now holding their own in all departments of life, in war and peace. They are now running, swimming, flying, driving, riding, piloting, drilling, knocking, kicking, catching, and showing their accomplishments in the professions and politics, in the play ground and ball room with as much dexterity as men. They are thinking, feeling and willing as vigorously as men. They are reading, writing, adding, subtracting, multiplying, dividing, teaching, lecturing, curing, arguing, lending, borrowing, marketing, manufacturing, uniting, intriguing, conspiring, and combining with equal adroitness. They are outwitting, thwarting, frustrating, circumventing, vanquishing, leading and commanding men as if they had been trained in these arts for centuries. At the same time they are cooking, washing, sweeping, shopping, singing, sewing, dancing, darning, knitting, conceiving, nursing and visiting much better and more amply than their mothers, to say nothing of their grand mothers and great grand mothers, who had no idea of urban life and society life. They are now living and dying like men. Had Huxley been alive to-day he would surely have modified his opinion about the woman question in the light of the above facts whose value must be

judged not only by their depth, but also by their expansiveness. Every year a larger proportion of women are paying more and more attention to those accomplishments which bring them nearer to men than to those which, according to orthodox ideas contrast them with the latter, which have for centuries induced men to think that they are unfit for any function except the one, emphasised by God by His famous curse upon the mother of mankind, and which distinctively confers on them the virtue of womanliness, contrasted with manliness, *i. e.*, humanliness, monopolised by the opposite sex which has deliberately opiated, stupefied, atrophied, nonentitized them by art and arbitrariness, to that extent that they came to be regarded as a mere adjunct, a geometric complement to a magnified obtuse angle. It is now clear that the perpendicular line of divine truth was imperceptibly deflected, degree after degree, for ages, so as to reduce the complement nearly to cipher. The deflection is proceeding in the opposite direction now.

Among other things Huxley would have been agreeably surprised to observe the remarkable contrivance by which woman has emancipated half her sex from the curse of conception, with its accompanying distresses and dangers in a way similar to that by which man has emancipated half his sex from the curse of unsavoury bread soaked in sweat, and he would have modified his opinion regarding the alternative of actuality and potentiality of motherhood in every woman.

If the progress of civilization depended upon a strict submission and conformity to the curses, humanity could not have advanced very far from what it was in Adam's generation. Fortunately Cain took the question of human civilization in his own hands and showed the way to western civilization by murdering his brother and then defying God with a clinching question when the latter wanted a plain answer, and subsequently by adopting a predatory life instead of a productive one like his old father, who delved in gravel and granite. He proved more clever than Jahveh whom he adroitly circumvented. Herbert Spencer supposes that Cain was an agriculturist. He may have been one before the soil was hardened, but he was shrewd enough to see that brigandage and conquest would have sooner or later a higher value than agriculture in the estimation of man. This discovery has been made by Mr. Bernard Shaw, and the world applauds him for his power of historical research, ("Back to Methuselah" Part I) as well as for his

literary skill. It is a remarkable fact that we get more penetrative light from literature than from science in tracing the causes and consequences of western civilization. What Cain did for man feminism will do for woman.

WHAT FEMINISM ASPIRES TO.

Feminism is a new word in the English language. It is not found in the body of Chambers, Twentieth Century Dictionary, but it occurs in the supplement. It means the movement for the advancement and emancipation of women. The definition is non-combative. But the pugnacity of man reads into it a desire on the part of woman to advance at the expense of man. Masculinism has existed for thousands of years, and was strongest in the second half of the matriarchal age. The establishment of the patriarchate on a firm foundation sent it into retirement. The English language was not in existence in the days of yore, and we do not know if masculinism had a name. Feminism has awakened it now. It is going to be formally baptised soon. Self-consciousness is preceded by the consciousness of the external world, particularly the world of destructive forces. Socrates knew that self-knowledge means complete knowledge, for it is preceded by the knowledge of the external world. Masculinism is gathering strong self-consciousness with the growing strength of feminism. Life becomes self-conscious by the knowledge of death, existence by that of extinction. Positive electricity gathers strength with the growing strength of negative electricity. Antagonism is not merely natural, but it is the very essence of life. Western civilization had a weak self-consciousness until it came to know of a different civilization in the east. It has existed for several thousand years, but has baptised itself only recently. Its principles of life and progress are in strong contrast with those of eastern civilization. Hence its rapid growth in distinctive strength and stubbornness.

The combative principle of life is inherent in western civilization, and has received its strongest development in it. The latter is prepared to thwart itself for the pleasure of conquest, for the satisfaction of pride, sometimes of mere vanity. If it finds no

adequate scope for its activities in the outer world it is prepared to carry this principle inward with its unseen consequences. White slavery came when black slavery ceased to give pleasure. It is creating masculinism because nationalism is getting insipid in the atmosphere of exhaustion in the desert of peace, created by the treaty of Versailles, while capitalism the other enlivening force, which makes life worth living is in a gruesome condition. Masculinism is justified because feminism threatens to usurp the professions and the public services, and to make encroachments on the golf and hockey ground. Land, air and water are all insecure against its trespasses. Feminism is a national danger that requires to be nipped in the bud. Fancy what would happen if in the next armageddon women led armies in the field and left men behind them. Masculinism is trying to take time by the forelock, but it seems too late. Combating falsehood is much easier than combating reality. It is no longer possible to say women, if emancipated, will make bad nurses, bad teachers, bad politicians, bad players, bad lawyers and bad surgeons. As to their making bad wives and bad mothers man has none but himself to thank for the result. Feminism proposes to introduce the principle of selection and specialization. Women, weak in the feministic, and strong in the masculinistic sense, alone will marry ; and motherhood will be reserved for certificated candidates only. It will be an institution endowed by the State. The real object is to bring in the superman, and to turn humanity into superhumanity as quickly as possible. The superman will come in triumph with military music enlivening the march ; he will not come like Christ stealthily at dead of night. He will be accompanied by superwomen, with the four gospels of eugenics, aesthetics, economics and ethics in their hands. Christ came for the salvation of man. The superman will come for his real civilization. He will not come to oppose western civilization, but to explain and interpret its inwardness, and improve upon it by throwing new lights upon it from new angles of vision. Darwin and Neitzsche will jointly play the part of John the Baptist. The feminists will play the part of the apotles. Like Christ, he will not bring peace, but a sword into society, and the sword will make a massacre of the illusion of traditions, customs, conventions, prejudices and prepossessions.

The question "What does feminism want?" does not admit of a cut and dried answer, because it is a revolutionary movement,

which means purposive evolution accelerated by purposeless opposition; and evolution once started can have no end. Biological evolution has not yet ended. We are expecting to see the superman supplant the man as he is. Herbert Spencer tried to see the culmination of western civilization in a kingdom of plenty and prosperity, of well proportioned labour and leisure, production and reproduction, egoism and altruism, nature and culture, but restrained himselt on second thought, I mean in the second edition of the Principles of Biology, because he discovered that evolution must be eternally regenerative if it is not to degenerate. The statical idea is alien to evolution.

When opposition is once turned into concession, voluntary or compulsory, inspired by generosity or self-interest, the course of evolution becomes irresistible and endless. The aims of feminism are endless. The French revolution was accelerated by concession. Concession kindled rebellion in the Americam colonies into a flame, and the flame into a blaze. Small concessions made by Charles I cost him his head, and James II his throne. The rebellion continued till 1832 when the Reform Act was passed, and this Act was followed by the Act of 1867. The most recent advance in democracy in England is marked by the enfranchisement of women. The evolution is not yet complete.

The introduction of romanticism and aestheticism in the relations of the sexes, and the substitution of the romantic for the religious-proprietary form of marriage by man in his own interest in reality, and in the interests of woman ostensibly, cut the canal which has eventually brought in the crocodile of feminism from the sea of subjection in which woman had floundered for ages. Thenceforth woman, imprisoned by the principle of domesticity as she was, did her best to coax out of man, trifling concessions which the latter was too glad to accord, as they enhanced her value in his own aesthetic eye. Wherever possible man relieves his wife of duties which discolours her skin, deforms her body, hardens her muscles, and interferes with her beauty and her stimulating qualities in other ways. He is always prepared to supplement her waning beauty with "drapery and accesories" which become particularly necessary from the age of thirty onward as calculated by Huxley, the most scientific connoisseur of the 19th century.

Since the beginning of the aesthetic epoch man has been conscious that of all kinds of subjection to which Mill has given scientific expression in his famous posthumous volume, the worst is the subjection of a woman's person to the processes of reproduction. Reproduction is a clumsy process as discovered by Mill and unworthy of Nature's ingenuity and generosity. But the average man did not possess the scientific boldness of Mill to openly challenge the aesthetic and hygienic sense of the divine regulator ; and social convention not only acquiesced in, but exalted the process as an ennobling act for both man and wife. Man has never inwardly accepted this idea in his heart, and is accepting it less in modern times, when the struggle for existence has been hardened beyond the bounds of tolerance, and when the addition of a mouth to a family means the lowering of the standard of life. In this lowering of the standard the husband suffers more grievously than his wife, who begins to be an old woman at thirty with redoubled demand for drapery and accessories. Her demands on account of the child do not lessen the most costly part of her personal demands, and sandwiched between the two the husband feels like Belgium in the great war on its western front. The aestheticism and romanticism of the early years of the union leave him desperately tortured and perplexed. It is a well-known fact in the history of warfare that little skirmishes are more exacerbating than pitched battles. Of the two kinds of feminism, public and domestic, the latter is more harrowing and embarrasing. Divorce alone can bring relief, but the law is irrational in most countries.

The higher aspirations of feminism are blossoming with the satisfaction of its lower expectations. Woman's restlessness grew as she increasingly became conscious of her position as an integral part of humanity to be admired by man. This consciousness thickened as she came to be admired not only for beauty but for intelligence and emotional qualities; as her whims were increasingly tolerated, her desires satisfied, and herself taken into confidence in the domestic concerns of life, and treated as an equal partner in the joys and sorrows of it. She gradually developed self-respect, jealousy and resentment at neglect, real or fancied, in proportion as her frailties ceased to be met by punishment, while her virtues received rewards. The gradual orientation of the psychology of mutual behaviour between man and wife is an interesting study.

Familiarity is a proverbial source of contempt. Love gradually loses its power to check this emotion, and in many cases contempt completely overpowers love, and seeks for divorce. Prudence intervenes to give relief by restraining the obtrusions of familiarity. But familiarity is etymologically associated with family ; and waxing familiarity relaxes domesticity, the diagnostic of conjugality. Generally one of the couple becomes a fool and the other a knave. The disjunctiveness of foolery and knavery is proverbial. This is how married life descends from a blessing into a curse, and this curse is prolonged by either law or longevity. 'Old man' and 'old fool' are almost synonymous for domestic purposes ; while 'old woman' is so pregnant with meaning that it has overflooded the sex wall.

I am now able to give a fairly satisfactory answer to the question, "what does feminism want ?" Feminism wants primarily to prevent the blessings of married life from turning into a curse. The rest of its programme is ancillary and auxiliary.

The romantic form of married life has existed for centuries growing with the growth of civilization, and of higher and more ethical ideas of domestic happiness. Domestic romanticism weakens with the growth of motherhood, which after strengthening the union ethically for a time gradually assumes its true reality as the family gets enlarged, and the husband becomes predominantly a father, and the wife, a mother. The original idea of the union is supplemented by a new idea of a complex nature, made worse by economic inadequacies, unequal physical decadence, and growing disparity of tastes and temperament. Estrangement, once started, persists and gathers force until conjugal life ceases to have significance. Wifehood and motherhood repel each other within the heart, while social conventions, economic obstructions, and blindness of ignorance and habit, and general helplessness try to retain the form of a relation which has lost its reality.

I am now in a position to add a substantive rider to the answer already given to the question, "What does feminism want ?" Feminism in its developed form wants to separate the two functions of woman, *viz.*, wifehood and motherhood, now blended into a coagulated clot of confusion. Two generations ago the idea of separating the two functions was brutally repulsive. The psychology of civilization has gradually steered in the direction of reality, and is now

prepared to tolerate the new idea in theory, though still rejecting it as a practicable social phenomenon. It is not so much afraid of the reality itself as of the possible existence of submarine rocks in the line of advance towards it. Sociological theories become social facts in the course of two or three generations, and feminism expects that this will happen in regard to the problem in question in due time, provided the propelling force is not wantonly interfered with. Most of what feminism anticipates is in the propaganda stage. It has already achieved much, and has more to achieve both in theory and practice. Since the "Subjction of women" was written by Mill, legislation has been fairly active ; and public education, including women's education, has advanced far to enlighten public opinion, to strengthen private opinion, to increase caution in unmarried youth, and circumspection in married sufferers. The Great War, on the other hand, has created facts out of necessity and opportunity, the proverbial parents of invention. These facts have happened on such a large scale that society, which created the War, and is conscious of its own share of responsibility in the affair, is getting prepared not merely to condone the facts but to defend them ethically. There are other facts created by western civilization which seem irresistible, though incompatible with the theory of marriage, of monogamy in particular.

It is a remarkable psychological phenomenon that while facts which happen on a small scale are penalised by public opinion, assume a favourable ethical complexion when they happen on a large scale. We are shocked by the idea of private murder, but we find glory in murder practised on a gigantic scale. The brigand's profession is universally detested. But Drake was knighted for practising this profession on a large scale. Massiveness has a charm distinct from quality. The pyramids are admired apart from their form and beauty. Perjury is culpable, but diplomacy is praiseworthy. Duelling is detestable, but war receives divine blessing. Enticing a neighbour's wife is vile, but the massiveness of adultery in war time sets people a-thinking if marriage is not a mere conventional institution, changeable by legislation. The law of divorce has undergone orientation, shocking to Christian conscience. The fruits of adulterous conjugation are washed into purity by the acid of legislation, and admitted into the currency of national population. Small coins can be thrown away if soiled or sweated, but a whole treasury cannot be treated in that wasteful way. Wifehood and

motherhood, it is said, are already largely separated in the most advanced countries, though the separation has not yet received legal sanction, but only acquiescence and connivance. Acceptance follows acquiescence, and approbation follows acceptance, and legislation follows public approbation in a democratically ruled country.

Let it not be supposed that feminism favours adulterous conjugation. Far from it. It considers such conjugation as wild and beastly, unworthy of civilization, because it is untouched by ethical love, and entirely inspired and guided by Freudian love, which is synonymous with libido, an irritation inherited from beast life.

I am now in a position to add a second rider to the answer. Feminism wants to abolish the sex trade. It is a most infamous trade which has lasted for more than five thousand years; and its wickedness seems to be drowned in the sea of time. The credit of rediscovering it belongs to feminism.

Western civilization is justly proud of having abolished the slave-trade, when it found it to be economically injurious, and ethically inhuman. Intellect and emotion combined their forces in the glorious adventure, represented by economism and eccleciasticism respectively. It is now being trained by feminism to abolish the sex-trade, a much older and a more firmly rooted business, carried on on two distinct systems, one of which is corollary to the other, *viz.*, the hire purchase system and the cash payment system. I ask the reader not to be shocked to know that the hire purchase system, by which delivery of goods is made at once by the vendor, on the security of an agreement executed by the purchaser and consumer, binding himself to make periodic payments in liquidation of the debt, represented by the value of the commodity, is a paraphrase of the institution of marriage. The other system is prostitution, pure and simple, which requires no explanation, except that it is a corollary of monogamy invented for the benefit of those who have not sufficient crédit in the marriage market, or are unwilling to enter into the impossible agreement, or are astute enough to forsee possibilities of damage, deterioration, depreciation and defective mechanism. These possibilities are growingly becoming actualities, and the proportion of men who prefer to go celebate is increasing in the thoughtful, reasonable, cultivated sections of society. Women

on their part detest marriage for obvious reasons. By marriage the spouse pretends to purchase the wife's sex only, but in reality he takes possession of her beauty, her intelligence, her muscles, her freedom and everything. The traditional price is wofully inadequate. Fancy a girl-graduate who can earn £200 a year, as a teacher, married to a man who earns £200 or possibly £150. She can enjoy half of it for one or two years, and then the growing family will gradually reduce her share to £50 or to £30 a year. Domesticity will strip her of her independence, which she values most. Her beauty will undergo rapid deterioration by mishandlng and motherhood which probably she does not want.

The unwary reader, in his very naivete will probably smile at what he considers to be the arrogance of ignorance, pompously brandishing minor arguments in perfect forgetfulness of the most vital fact, *viz.*, love and promise of life-long love, which underlie conjugal relations. I may assure him that feminism takes full account of this much talked of, little understood fact, but knowing that love has been grievously damaged by civilization, by the hardening struggle for existence, by the growing desire to raise the standard of life (the very diagnostic of western civilization) by the facilities of rapid locomotion, by the will to power, will to command, will to freedom and by a thousand other exigencies of civilized life, it refuses to attach any value to promise of love, which by itself is subtle, spiritistic, deceptive, precarious, volatile and unsubstantial. It is prepared to concede marriage where love exists, and indeed considers it to be the best form of union between the sexes, provided divorce is made completely free, in order to guard against the vagaries and vagrancies of love.

God condemned Cain to be a fugitive, and failed. Western civilization has cursed love to be a fugitive and has succeeded. Love has been cursed, condemned, confused, confounded. It has now ceased to have any ethical value. It has been sophisticated and vulgarised by Freud and other eminent scientists, who think they have done a great service to truth, to man and society by stripping this impostor of its cloak of deceit and hypocrisy. God, according to these scientists, can not be the object of love because he has no skin, no sex, no form, no colour to excite it. Woman alone can be the object of love to man, but even she cannot expect it to be lasting, because western civilization has condemned it to be a

fugitive of extremely restless habits, always saying to itself "anywhere but here."

Bernard Shaw regards marriage as a profession for women. But like the Belgian policeman, who arrested a socialist, and refused to release him, when told that the latter was not an anarchist, I must confess I am unable to find much difference between a profession and a trade. Orthodox opinion would be equally shocked by either view. The points of agreement and difference are not unintelligible, but the former are more important. It is not necessary to enter into a discussion of the origin of the institution, but it seems clear that its history is traceable to barter, the primitive form of trade. Both sexes concerned in the transaction are vendors as well as consumers. The consumption takes place on the spot. One can easily imagine a costermonger and a confectioner meeting on the street each giving out of his own basket, and taking out of the other's, eating to full satiation and then departing refreshed, each on his own way. Barter is a trade not a profession.

Next suppose a girl oppressed by hunger and a young confectioner, by sex-impulse, meeting near a thicket. Here the meeting may develop into a more advanced form of barter. There is no question of profession yet. Next suppose these two creatures regularly meet by appointment. We may proceed step by step to a stage in which the elements of profession and trade are confused. The ultimate culmination is called marriage. The wickedness of man appears when he tries to make a profit, that is, to obtain a surplus advantage. It is difficult to measure the surplus, because it has been changeful throughout the history of the institution, and the change has mostly been towards growth. Penetrative self-consciousness has changed the outlook of woman. She now perceives how she has been duped, and transfigured into a fairly fed, fairly clothed slave. Feminism, which is the scientific name for female self-consciousness, has appeared in two forms, domestic and public, to save mankind from the infamy of having half the race living in slavery. Of these two forms, domestic feminism like sabotage in the first empire, is more effective than public agitation. Woman has been constrained to adopt this criminal form of feminism, because public opinion showed an unreasonable measure of deafness to its public propaganda. The Combination Act against reformers and revolutionists has been severely enforced by internment or

compulsory domesticity in some countries, and by actual undiscriminating imprisonment in others. Woman had therefore no weapon left but sexual sabotage. Badly cooked food, badly nursed children, mismanagement in house-keeping and general wastefulness, conscious and unconscious, deliberate and spontaneous, voluntary and involuntary, mark the course of domestic feminism. This feminism is monstrously contagious, and the entire world seems to be suffering from the effects of it now. Nietzsche's comprehensive declaration against domestic feminism, wrongly interpreted as innate nature of woman, is accessible to the reader in the famous essay on "Our virtues", in "Beyond Good and Evil". Domestic feminism has been so severely successful that one may hear, if one has ears to hear, the words 'of marriage' added to "Lead us not into temptation", in the daily prayer, as repeated by unmarried men, and "Deliver us from the evils of marriage" as repeated by the married ones. Women too daily repeat the same modified form of prayer, and the result is visible in protracted bachelorhood and spinsterhood, complete celibacy, and increasing divorce. Where love ceases conjugality ought to cease, and where love is not the inspiring force, not merely conjugality, but even occasional conjugation ought to be restrained. That is one of the articles of the feminist's creed. Feminism in short wants to abolish the sextrade. It does not want to abolish true marraige inspired and maintained by genuine love, but the vulgarised love which is identified with reiterative libido, Of course mercenary marriage is condemned with all the emphasis feminism can command.

Another item in the demands of feminism is leisure. The married woman in whom the potentiality of motherhood has been turned into actuality lives under such constant worry of petty activities that she has no leisure left for self-culture. Nature which compels her to attend to children in sick bed conspires with the inconsiderate husband who imposes recurrent motherhood to leave her no leisure to continue the culture which she acquired in her pre-marital collegiate life. This is one of the reasons which makes her impatient of married life. She suffers from what she regards as the vulgarising influence of marriage. She feels it most when she comes in contact with an unmarried school fellow, whose time is at her own disposal. Ladies with leisure, whether married or unmarried, shine best in social meetings. They speak politics and philosophy, and demonstrate their academic equality with cultured

men, while the good mother occupies a back seat in the drawing room, bitterly oppressed by the feeling that her life is not worth living. Cultured wives mated with considerate husbands and who are not overburdened with motherhood are perhaps the happiest of the sex, but they are an infinitesimal fraction of entire womanhood. They are a temptation to their sisters, who live a life of vacillation and then plunge into misery at Nature's unresisted call. A woman once tempted to marry lives a life of misery, if she fails to find a considerate husband, like one of those lucky ladies. Harrison was such a husband. He expected all ladies to live like Lady Harrison, and denounced votes for women, who were beginning to be fond of doing things better done by men, and averse from what woman alone can do but he failed to perceive that he was an exceptional husband, and his wife was an exceptional lady. He therefore sternly opposed feminism.

Feminism demands economic independence for every woman married or unmarried. Human nature craves for it. It is not afraid of hard labour or moist bread. It wants the consciousness of having earned it, and of the power of disposing of it. Life loses nine parts of its value when it is lived in dependence. No body likes to live at the sweet will and pleasure of another, who can at any time say, "You will have this and that but not the other thing." Self respect is impossible for a man who depends for his food and clothing and house shelter upon another. He is regarded as a man of the meanest sort, and is openly scorned for it. There are parasites of a high species, and every body wishes to have a place in it. Such parasites are feared and respected. They command ; they do not obey. The life of a dependant parasite is not worth living. It is precarious at best. He does not know for certain whether the next meal will be allowed or withheld.

In India the joint family system has been dying out because self-respect has been spreading among the adult male members of the family. They hear among the earning members and their wives constant whisper of the most humiliating kind about their education, their intelligence, their character and their consuming capacity, the size of their stomachs, the volume of their bodies, and the quantity of carbonic acid gas they breathe out, and waste food they eject. They are compared to elephants and buffaloes, but not in reference to their carrying power, scientifically known as horse power.

The struggle for existence rejects the parasites first. Even old women are disgusted by their presence and existence in the family. These parasites may be useful to the family in various ways, but their services are never considered adequate return for what they consume. They are supposed to consume first and to serve next, whereas the normal order is to give service first and to consume next.

Women in the civilized countries are feeling the same sort of feelings as the parasites of the joint family in India. A spinster no longer thinks of living with her brother, but seeks employment as a governess in a family or a nurse in a hospital. Among the lower classes even the father will send his grown up daughter to the factory, where life is by no means enviable, economically, morally, socially, or in any other way except sub-humanly, when she has failed to find a husband, or as Bernard Shaw might say, to find a place in her own legitimate and reserved profession.

Old affections are being squeezed out by the pressure of the hardening struggle for existence. Civilization hardens the struggle for its own benefit in the aggregate, but people suffer in detail. That is the law of progress. The struggle for existence is really a struggle for self-existence. Man cannot love his wife, brother cannot love his sister, father cannot love his daughter when the struggle rages round the self. In cyclonic floods mothers have been known to tear off babies from their breasts. Civilization lives in a perpetual cyclone. Peace or calm weather would kill it. Such is its nature. Western civilization beats all other civilizations hollow in this respect.

Society having admitted the principle of woman-labour in factories cannot debar woman from the higher professions, and gradually women are achieving a wonderfully peaceful penetration. There are old women in the other sex who are alarmed by the scarcity of openings for men, as if the latter had acquired an inviolable, inextinguishable vested right in all professims. The struggle for existence is meant for all. The curse of God was meant for men and women alike, though Moses probably misunderstood God, and though Christians misunderstood Moses. Man does not live by bread alone. He marries and multiplies. Woman does not live by merely conceiving and bringing forth children in sorrow. She also eats and earns ; spins and weaves.

The desire of independence in woman supposed to spring out of sightless sordidness shows its inwardness by the consciousness felt by her that to be a true partner to man, to be his friend and not his ward she must prove her fitness by taking part in the struggle for existence, with all its distresses, dangers and defeats, as well as its victories and triumphs. It is sometimes supposed that civilization has by its own laws, apart from the deliberate schemings of man, brought about a situation in which woman is getting increasingly unfit for activities other than what are connected with reproduction. It is admitted that the schemitism of man has to some extent reinforced civilization in this respect. Feminism is astute enough to perceive that if woman's present condition is bad, it must, left to itself, be worse in the future. Feminism is therefore all the more justified in its militancy.

Woman wants to try her chance, and if she fails she will not only have none but herself to thank, but she will be compelled to re-accept her old position in the family with the tranquility engendered by necessity, and if civilization really means the civilization of man, as distinguished from woman, designed by God to be subservient to him, resignation will add to the value of the tranquility thus engendered.

The success of woman in securing partial independence, whether by way of open victory or as a diplomatic concession made by man, is an unmistakeable indication that the present position of woman is satisfying neither to herself nor to her husband. Feminism is not limited to the feminine sex. Both sexes are restless. The husband as a rule, wants her to submit like her predecessors of the religious proprietary days. The wife wants the advantages of the truly ethical union. The reality is a mixture of both, dissolved in the spirit of romantic eroticism. It must be admitted that of the three forms of conjugality the romantic form, lying between the other two, is transitional and therefore precarious.

Woman shows magnanimity when she wants to share with man the trials and tribulations of the struggle for existence. Masculinism wants to turn her back by preaching her natural inferiority and incompetence, and by adding insult to injury in the shape of admonitive efforts to convince her of the great generosity shown by man in keeping her outside the fire line of struggle. Animal life does not show this distinction between the sexes. Savage life shows

it to a smaller extent than civilized life. But it is argued on behalf of feminism that life in western civilization has outclimbed the point where civilization merges into super-civilization ; and that super civilized standards necessarily transcend the standards of common civilization, which stands above semi-civilization. It is the call of a higher life that involuntarily compels woman to spurn with contempt rights without responsibilities, and favours without a fair field, and gratuitous concessions sweetened by admonitions.

Lastly, feminism wants freedom for woman, that is, freedom of thought, freedom of expression and freedom of action, as much freedom as Mill, in his moderation, suggests, and a little more to suit the time, that is, as much freedom as Morley in his uncompromising spirit, (spirit, running through his discussions "On Compromise") thinks necessary for progress of civilization. Woman's thought has become free by the study of science and literature generally, and by the study of feministic literature in particular. She is no longer restrained in her thought, but law and public opinion do not allow her an adequate measure of freedom of expression, in speech or print. As to action she is still shy, and she wants to shake off her shyness gradually, and to enlighten the world with scientific decency on the mysteries of love of which she is designed by Nature to have a better mastery than man. Medical men suffer from insufficient information, and misinformation about feminine psychology of love and sexual relations. Feminism wants to bring light into the world, real light, not the obfuscating light which Jahveh created by the first creative fiat in the twinkling of an eye.

THE REALITY AT THE ROOT.

Feminism has divided the cultivated world into feminists, masculinists, experimentalists and resignationists. The last three represent different forms of anti-feminism. Every movement creates a counter movement, where civilization has advanced far. Feminists, while a general agreement runs through them all, are divided in matters of detail. They all find the life of woman unsatisfying to her, and propose to change it by educating public opinion, and by improved legislation. They are prepared to compel

legislation by might, where right fails to effect it. Its programme has been considerably helped by direct action, taken by woman individually, each on her own account. This may be called domestic feminism, which has established a harassing tyranny, causing grievous suffering to individual men in proportion to the weakness betrayed by them in the early stages of their married life, and they cry as loudly for change, as their wives, while they are wofully perplexed to find a remedy. This feminism is either contagious or simultaneous. The last is worse than the first. The truth seems to be that feminine psychology has received a comparatively sudden orientation of a desperate nature, and has taken the masculine world by surprise. The life of woman is associated with a number of institutions, and a change in it implies a change in one or more of these institutions, some of which are as old as civilization. To change one of these is to change each of them more or less.

Masculinists are confused by the unexpected rapidity with which feminism has spread, and are divided in opinion as to the causes of this violent movement, and they are still more confused by the success which it has attained in a comparatively short time. When the causes are confused, the remedies are worse confounded. As a rule in advanced civilization remedy is generally worse than the social diseases, which it is designed to cure.

Some masculinists ascribe the movement to pure feminine perversity, which they think can be cured by a sudden and unexpectedly strong slap on the face. Shrewishness is not a new thing created in the 20th century. It has existed in endemic form for ages. But the 20th century has turned it into a virulent epidemic, and there lies the real trouble.

Some masculinists think that the success of the movement indicates that the power of woman is outgrowing that of man; others are of opinion that man is absolutely degenerate and decadent, while woman is advancing. This opinion deserves serious consideration. There is another opinion that woman's perversity is mixed up with rationality, and the remedy lies in checking the perversity and encouraging the rationality, which is a highly complex process, while the analysis of the elements of perversity and rationality leads to a hopeless diversity of opinion. This much is now admitted by all intelligent men that a mere slap in the face is

not adequate in grappling successfully with the situation. Mr. Ludovici while admitting the decadence of man, proposes the abolition of democracy as a true remedy. But that is a very large order. Neither supermen nor better men, sporadically appearing in society can do much ; and when entire masculinity is turned into supermen or better men, democracy will be free from its stigmatic disfiguration. It is difficult to see how supermen can at all emerge out of a sloughy swamp of decadence, and raise the world from the abyss below into etherial skies above.

Mr. Ludovici gives the following interesting account of the present situation :—There is "a marked decline in the ability, versatility and masculinity of men, which is the outcome partly of physical and partly of intellectual inferiority, brought about on the one hand by besetting and cramping labour for generations, and on the other, by the deliberate attempt, throughout Anglo-saxon civilization and its imitations, to limit the notion of manliness to martial bravery and proficiency at sports. This has led to a loss of mastery over all things which is far from edifying, and has enabled women during the last century, and recently to draw unduly favourable comparisons between themselves and men which while comprehensible in the circumstances, give quite a distorted view of the situation. It is the case of two climbers M. & W. who while ascending a hill, find that through the sudden weakness of M. W.'s pace appears to be wonderfully enhanced. W. however, interprets M.'s slackened speed not as abnormal weakness but as accelerated speed on her part, and therefore feels contempt for M. as M. not merely as enfeebled M."

He seems to think that man's present weakness is rather a disease than a degeneration. Elsewhere he appears to think that if man used prophylactics instead of curatives, contented himself with tottering and painful teeth instead of resorting to "manufactured dentition", and sucked mother's breast instead of rubber bulbs attached to bottles, he would soon recover his whilom masculinity, brainpower, will-power and soul-force. But these suggestions leave the real source of the disease untouched. I shall presently advert to what seems to be the reality at the root. Meanwhile some general remarks on the present situation may be useful.

We are accustomed to think of a civilization as something immutable, statically fixed and objectively stable. But such a

civilization has in reality very little value. Objectively a civilization should present a new phase every moment of its life. Western civilization is presenting it every year. The annual administration reports of the various countries ought to convince one that the situation changes from year to year. What ought to be stable are the fundamental principles, mostly psychological, which underlie the situation and explain the change from the old. The question is "Are these principles changing" "Are these principles anyway affected or modified by divergent or conflicting principles?" "If there are conflicting principles at work which of them is predominant?" "If the balance is even at the present moment between any two of them, which of the two is waxing and which is waning?" Every principle ought to remain stable qualitatively, but not necessarily quantitatively. Quantitative changes produce orientations in external appearance which are deceptive in their form and character.

Western civilization, superficially observed, looks like a fusion of Bible christanity, official christanity, sagaism, survivalism and will-to-power. It contains all the elements of Greek life from Homerism to Platonism, and all the principles of European life from barbarism to modernism. Love and hate, reverence and scornfulnes, courage and fear, charity and cruelty, shame and defiance, nobility and sordidness, magnanimity and meanness, arrogance and modesty, stubbornness and placability are all present in it. It is enthusiastic in all things, good and evil. Indifference is conspicuously absent.

In the midst of this confusion it is possible to discern the strongest guiding principle, *viz.*, survivalism. It is the principle which regards life as a struggle for existence and appraises it by actual survival. The desire to survive shows itself behind its behaviour towards neighbours. It seeks co-operation as ancillary to competition. Self is necessarily the centre of life's activities. Self-negation is condemned as unworthy of man. Self-aggrandisement is admired as the highest ideal. The group-self confers on the idea of self a dignity and strength, which carry with them the will-to-power, the will-to-ascendancy. This will creates enemies all around, even among those whose co-operation is absolutely necessary for self-preservation. Western civilization loses its meaning and purpose when it fails to face them, openly or diplomatically. Its life is a

continuous stream of war, actual or potential, open or hidden. Peace is impossible in this civilization, and if there is no foreign war to keep up the zest of life, it creates civil war. If there is no war between masculine groups, it creates one between the sexes. At present both kinds of civil war are raging in the civilized countries.

Survival means "whether you can kill me or I can kill you," in the last analysis. The sexual will-to-power has been growing through ages in woman's breast, which can find a commodious place for it now, because it is dry of milk. This 'will' has burst into activity now, with an excess population magnanimously left by the great war, creating an unprecedented struggle for existence among women, who under othodox rule can live only by the profession of marriage, while monogamy makes it impossible for all of them to marry. Feminism means a struggle for feminine existence, a struggle for employment, a struggle for proving fitness to survive, a struggle for ascendancy, if possible.

Western civilization has lived and is living such a rapid life and the inter-relations of the organs have become so delicate, that interference with one of them upsets the whole organism and brings on disorders in such unexpected quarters that diagnosis becomes impossible. The truth is that differentiation and progress have marched at a higher pace than integration, carrying with them disruptive forces and seeds of disorder which confound the intelligence of man, and he finds it impossible to face the situation. Hydraulically speaking, western civilization has an unstable metacentre. It was to this fact that Huxley referred when he regretted not merely its lack of ideals, but of the instability of this apparently grand but inwardly sickly structure. Mr. Ludovici ascribes this sickliness to the use of 'extra corporeal substitutes' for the growth of the human body and the preservation of its fitness. He supposes that in the body-despising value, originally created by faith in christianity, and afterwards supported by science, lies hidden the seed. He supposes also that man has suffered more than woman. He is undoubtedly wrong in this diagnosis, for woman has always been more faithful than man to the principles of christianity, but in practical life she has never valued the soul more than the body. If the body has become weak and deformed under-valuation is certainly not the cause. On the other hand over-valuation of the body seems to be the true cause of the sickliness of western civilization. It

has led to too much indulgence in war and mock war, otherwise called games and sports, and above all in sexual extravagances and irregularities. Men are in practical life polygamous, while legally they are monogamous, and women are ployandrous. (See Hymen by Norman Haire) "A rather small section of the public genuinely believes that sexual relations outside marriage are wicked" (See Social Reconstruction by Bertrand Russell). There is a distinct tendency in scientfic opinion to hold that free gratification of the sexual impulse is wholesome, while inhibition desperately and most unwisely encounters nature in an unequal fight leading to mutilation and emaciation.

If the masculinists are divided in their opinion as to causes, they are hopelessly confused as to remedies. Society has lost its constitutional balance by hypertrophy in some organs and atrophy in the rest. Western civilization is a lunatic, a genius and an idiot combined. He is a bad military general that takes no adequate account of the demands of the several fronts, and finds himself frustrated by his own victories. As a matter of common observation its objective conquests make it neglect peace at home. At heart it is more destructive than creative, because it follows the principle of natural selection, which destroys a thousand to preserve and advance one. Until recently its creative power had a surplus balance, which is now spending itself in destructive operation. Its power over external nature creates external, gorgeous forces which thwart and demoralize human nature, unseen, from behind the screen. It conquers nature in order to destroy neighbours with the help of the booty obtained from the vanquished foe ; and now at length it threatens to destroy itself with poison made in its own laboratory. It marvels at its creative power and is thrown into such ecstacy over it that it fails to discern the destructive power that lies hidden within it. It loses its balance of mind when it finds that an instrument made for destruction can be used for purposes of creation also. It loses sight of the fact that for one such instrument there are dozens, which, originally designed for construction, have turned out to be destructive. It substitutes machine power for horse power ; horse power for man power ; and man power for soul power. It gains the world to lose the soul. It substitutes extra-corporeal device to play the part of natural forces ; manufactured teeth for natural teeth ; bottle feeding for breast feeding ; forceps for natural

parturition ; ectogenesis for natural conception ; concubinage for marriage ; nursing home for nursery ; hotel for domesticity ; railway berth for home.

The civilized races will never forget their obligation to western civilization for many good things of life, but these things have been bought at famine price ; and they will remember with bitter feelings particularly one great harm which it has done, and is still doing in adversely affecting the inner being by its detrimental action on sexual life. It weakens and dislocates the nervous system in both sexes, and in the second place, it unequally affects them. What is called sublimation is many times more counterbalanced by the depreciative process of vicarious discharge of nerve stimulation. In women this kind of discharge continued for years lead to neurasthenia, hysteria, perversity, insanity and idiocy, and sometimes to lunacy. The reaction of western civilization with its ceaseless activity and anxiety, its hardening struggle for existence, its limited selections and abounding rejections, its ruthlessness and relentlessness, shows itself in slow degeneration of intelligence and will-power, of true masculinity in short. The unequal effect is, however, in favour of the feminine sex on the whole, and the accumulated balance of centuries, particularly of the last hundred years has produced a state of things which has enormously reduced the value of man in the eye of woman. She now looks upon him with contempt as pointed out by the masculinist Ludovici in "Lysistrata."

If general familiarity breeds contempt, sexual familiarity develops it surprisingly. Man impelled by his sexual ardour forgets the sexual vigour of his wife, and exposes himself with ridiculous frequency to her judgment, and stupidly reinforces her contempt. Woman values nothing in man more than his power manifested in gratifying her sexual desire. Her aesthetic desires compensatively grow with her failure to obtain satisfaction for her sexual desire. It is true sexual desire is not so easily excited in her as in man. But when once excited it flows vigorously, and a dam raised across the insurgent stream inundates the neighbouring nerve plains, where life which is lived peacefully in normal circumstances, becomes restive and desperate and distressful. The inundation injures the crops of intelligence and good emotions, and leaves them to rot in what is known as mental deficiency. It may destroy the crops altogether and substitute weeds and tares, nettles and thistles

which prick the husband here, there and everywhere, and make his life a burden to him. The constant irritation at home, and the struggle for existence abroad, conspire to bring on idiocy and what is known as the inferiority complex. It is this last thing that accounts for the marvellous success of feminism. Feminism is thriving because masculinity is moribund.

Nobody can reasonably find fault with woman for termagancy if he knows anything about the nervous system and its connection with psychology. The ravages of a single inundation may be retrieved by diligence. But fancy the flood coming every year, I mean every week, and sometimes more frequently. The wonder is not that so many women have lost their womanliness and turned feminists, but that entire womanhood does not constitute a huge asylum, nay, entire humanity have not degenerated into something worse than brutes and beasts. Mr. Wells said "Wes ,rn civilization is a sexual lunatic". What he precisely meant is not known, but it seems to every reasonable man that every civilized man has reason to be a lunatic, whether he is married or unmarried, directly if he is married ; indirectly if he refuses to marry for economic and other trifling considerations. Holmes, in his humour, said at the Breakfast Table that every reasonable man has good reason to be insane. There is quite as much truth as humour in this aphorism. What is humanity to do to obtain relief from the paradoxes of sexual life and their repercussions on life in general? Marriage has a tendency to send humanity into lunacy. Celibacy has the same effect. Nature and culture are in conspiracy. Nature calls for sexual union at adolescence. Culture forbids it. Nature says "Conjugate or be miserable". Culture says "Do not marry or you will be insane". Western civilization suggests the convenient course of conjugation without conventional conjugality, and this is the direction in which civilization is steering without chart and compass. I mean it is drifting.

It is said woman is by nature polyandrous. This opinion is quite true of her second nature, for the repurcussions of civilization have a distinctive tendency to increase the polyandrous desire, if not the actual habit. The growing sexual weakness of man harrows her with ridiculous aggresiveness, for man finds compensation in increasing sexual ardour for decreasing sexual vigour. Monogamy brings madness to her like mustard seeds introduced in the earcavity

of a buffalo. She runs about for relief, in her desire, if not actually in space ; and there is ployandry in the seed plot. Certainly civilized woman has reason to be polyandrous. The reaction of her insanity upon her husband is clearly visible to those who have eyes to see. Her irresponsiveness, her refusal, her persistent recalcitrancy makes him seek for gratification elsewhere, and he rediscovers that he is polygamous at heart. Indeed he has reason to be. If polyandry and polygamy are forcibly withheld by law and convention, there is the risk of insanity overspreading the land. Indeed increasing insanity and idiocy, mental deficiency and utter dementation constitute a serious problem for civilization to grapple with at the present moment.

Western civilization in its present mood approves of every form of sexual relation, polyandry, polygamy, prostitution and promiscuity. But it finds it hard to support abstinence, most probably because it is distinctly eastern in its origin and development, and only diffidently approved by science. Yet it almost shamelessly pretends that every man and woman in the west absolutely abstain for ten or fifteen years of their lives, when the sex appetite is fresh and almost orgasmically obstreperous, I mean from the beginning of adolescence to its end, and longer, according to circumstances. In many cases the abstinence is pretended to be life-long, while in others it extends until the sex appetite has grown dull, and its gratification brings no pleasure, but only relief. It is persistently affirmed also that in the middle ages, when catholicism and monasticism prevailed, abstinence as a theory of life, was vigorously tried in practice, and weighed in the balance, and found wanting. It is also persistently affirmed that in the semi-civilized East the same experiment is now being tried by forcing widows, of whom there are millions in India, to a life of compulsory abstinence. It is difficult to understand whether abstinence or compulsoriness is the real objective at which derision is directed. An American lady of high political aptitude with a touch of night-blindness and long-sightedness recently came to India to make sexological research, and discovered a rotten state of things in which women and specially widows suffered monstrously by the cruelties of masculinity.

Do women in civilized countries abstain for a long period if not for life? There are six million women in England alone who are not married and who do not expect to be. Whether they abstain

or not the state of things is rotten ; for abstinence means in science a pathological state of mind and body, and indulgence means moral vileness. If they do abstain what compels them to abstain ? If they do not really abstain, what compels them to pretend that they do abstain, when civilization inwardly conspires against abstinence ? Is hypocisy an essential element of western civilization ? Perhaps Katherine Mayo and her millions of admirers and supporters have in their possession truths which may throw light on this enigmatic situation, and on facts which warrant them to throw stones at the unsecretiveness of vice.

In ancient India three famous women, of the highest character in the history of conventional sexual morality were polyandrous, and two more remarried after the death of their husbands. All five are remembered down to this day, every morning by millions of men and women, as exemplars of circumstantial sexual morality, not as warnings to the womanhood of subsequent ages. The courage and candour of the Eastern mind is clearly visible in this opinion, though there has been a change of moral ideas since the age of the Pandavas, who carried in their veins not a drop of the blood of Pandu, and who married a woman, who would fain have a sixth husband added to the five with whom circumstances had blessed her already. This sixth man was the issue of premarital sexual relations, while the other five were products of extra-matrimonial relations (herein described as polyandrous relations). Why can't we find similar candour in the women of the west except among those who have studied science and become feminists at heart? The subsequent change of moral ideas in India belongs to degeneracy. In the Western world polyandry is secretive, and is waiting for time to face the light.

The mother of three of the Pandavas selected for conjugation three supermen, unscientifically called gods, and she brought forth three supermen, who have made the history of India, *viz.*, the Mahabharata, a record of glory, which still excites pride in the nationalistic bosom of her people, degenerate as it is. Pandu, the conventional father of these supermen was a sexual imbecile, and he gladly gave his consent to his wife to entertain visitors on the understanding that she would base her selections on strictly eugenic principles. The step mother of these supermen betrayed uneugenic polyandrous extravagance by inviting two minor gods to the same bed, and she was peremptorily deprived of the valued privilege.

Subsequent history tends to show that these cases of polyandry were exceptions, stigmatic yet admirable. Some western historians labour under the erroneous impression that the Pandavas lived in primitive times. But this is too absurd to call for further comment. It was the polyandry of high civilization that gave India Yudhistir, Bhim and Arjuna. It is the polyandry towards which western civilization is now slowly marching with eugenic equipments, but in which it is now clandestinely wallowing in shame, soiled by the sense of moral degradation and contraceptive corruption. The time is coming when the civilized lady, fit to specialize in babies, will make no difference, in her sexual selection between the Duke and the cook, when her natural instincts, free from the trammels of convention, and fortified by the knowledge of science will unerringly embrace the man who will bring her animal satisfaction and spiritual reward, reward in the shape of blessed reproduction, who will regenerate the decadent civilization with its weak masculinity and chauvinistic feminism, and fill the world with supermen and superior women, who will behave towards one another in ideal ways, after razing the empire of sex to the ground. The new civilization will be called super-civilization, for men will become supermen.

As to the polygamousness of man it is unnecessary to offer much explanation. Facts ancient and modern, patriarchal and democratic, of savage and civilized life, furnish ample evidence on the subject. The greatest polygamist in the world was perhaps the chauffeur of Arjuna at the great war of India, who in his youth had sixty four thousand wives, all satisfied and none disgruntled. He was a superman, no doubt, but there is reason to think that at the time when he lived the average man and the average woman had a better sexual physique. Probably polygamy was a necessity and polyandry a matter of comfort in those days. The present lamentable situation seems due to the progress of western civilization, the most nerve-shattering variety of civilization the world has ever known. It acts directly and by repercussion, and devitalizes man through woman, and woman through man. It divides in order to rule ; and rules in order to divide. That is its principle of life everywhere. It divides man from man ; man from woman ; race from race. This principle has its limitations. It is useful for sometime ; sometimes for a long time ; never for ever. The result is that it has nearly lost two of its empires, namely, the empire

of property and the empire of masculinity. As to the empire of religion it never had any respect for it, but kept it alive as a useful instrument for upholding the first two empires, and as an advantageous legacy from catholic civilization, for creating the empire of race over race, the empire of civilized men over savages, of christians over heathens, of white men over coloured men, among whom it went with the Bible, and finished its work with the bottle ; went with christian maxims and finished with maxim guns.

The reality at the root of feminism has now been discovered. It is the antagonism between sexual ardour and sexual vigour in man that accounts not only for the birth of feminism but for its rapid growth, expansion and achievements. The struggle between ardour and vigour has resulted in the victory of ardour in man, and of vigour in woman. This is the most remarkable phenomenon in western civilization. The antagonism and struggle have existed in all other civilizations, but never with such conspicuous results as in western civilization. There is reason to believe that Roman civilization was lost in this struggle, but there is no clear evidence available for coming to any definite conclusion. There is no record of the struggle left, except that women had developed almost a brutal contempt for their husbands. The tyranny of domestic feminism, the guerilla form of sex warfare, was largely felt by husbands. But there is no record of pitched battles, of electioneering tactics, of open arson, of platform artillery and printed poison.

The conversation between Praxinoe and Gorgo reproduced in Mathew Arnold's essay on "Pagan and Mediaeval Religious Sentiment" is representative, in which Praxinoe describes her husband as "insane, stupid, great, big, interminable animal". This may be compared with what Cecile said to her husband, namely. "Oh you brutal villain, you jealous wretch ! Speak gently if you want the door to be opened. Big booby do not stand gaping at what you see." This is how she addressed her husband, when the latter was knocking at the door, and she was engaged in gratifying her sexual appetite in her bed room with a pagan. It occurs in Chapter X, Book VII, Penguin Island, by Anatole France. The chapter bears the representative heading, "The zenith of Penguin civilization" Here Penguin civilization is only an artistic name substituted for western civilization. Further comment is unnecessary.

Where life is a struggle for existence and for power the equipment for success, and the test of survival lies in the degree of contempt which one feels for his neighbours. The successful speaker addressing an assembly, must feel a supreme contempt for the intelligence of the entire audience. The successful general must feel a contempt for the general on the hostile side. Successful competition implies this contempt. Western civilization is founded upon this contempt, contempt for neighbour, contempt for woman, contempt for the credulous and contempt for other races. These four kinds of contempt have enabled western civilization to found the Quadruple Empire. All the four empires are declining because 'contempt' has changed sides. This contempt may exist collectively in groups or individually or in both ways. The labourer personally feels no contempt for the aristocrat. But the proletariat feels it for the aristocracy. In the empire of sex, however, woman personally, and women collectively, feel contempt for man and for masculinity respectively. The empire of sex is therefore in a worse plight than the empire of property.

Nothing creates greater contempt for a man in the breast of a woman than the weakness of his sexual vigour, and nothing creates greater admiration for him than his superior sexual strength, verified by direct experience. Lady Hamilton admired Nelson. A lot of women admired Napoleon, because they had actual experience of his sex vigour. The average woman despises her husband as the result of experience also, though he may be an artist, a warrior, a scientist, a philosopher or a D.Litt., with a world-wide fame. I shall now state from authoritative sources how widespread feminine contempt for man is at the present day in civilized countries.

The following quotations from Dr. Beale's Wise Wedlock (p. 80) are convincing :—

"Our diagnosis of the trouble must be in the most direct language, or it will necessarily miss its mark. Beginning with woman's side of the case, we say plainly and categorically that for her the great cause of marital failure is summed up in sexual unsatisfaction. She has had frequent unions with her husband, she may even at times have experienced desire for union, but the act itself has given her neither thrill nor relief, because it has led her to no sensory or emotional climax for her ; it has on the contrary left her wakeful, nerve-racked, a prey to vague irritability and vague depression. Instinct

tells her that this is not as it should be, that there is something wanting, something that is essential; reflection adds its voice to that of instinct, and declares that such results as these are not worth the discomfort and risk involved in the discomfort of pregnancy the risk of attending child birth."

"While exact figures are in the nature of the case not available, it is estimated that seven out of every ten married women of the English speaking race experience no climax in the conjugal embrace. corresponding to that which in man accompanies the discharge of the semen; for the multitude of wives this embrace is something they undergo in satisfaction of their husbands' wants, but without any satisfaction to themselves, rather with consequences as we have described."

One need not exhaust all his available sympathy with the English speaking race. Other races living in the whirr and noise of western civilization are in the same boat. But the English speaking race, specially Englishmen, have enjoyed and endured this beneficent, cruel civilization for a longer time than the rest. Their enjoyment has come to its climax; their endurance has run half its course. They are afraid to advance; they are afraid to recede. The first would lead them into the abyss. The last would be ignominious. They are faltering, halting, hesitant. They are mixing up mutually antagonistic principles of behaviour towards self and neighbour, and sapping the foundations of their civilization. Socialism and Neo-Darwinism; christanity and agnosticism; charity and cruelty; support for weak and plans for their destruction; despotism and democracy; feminism and masculinism; faith and infidelism; scepticism and credulity; puritanism and scientificality; reverence for life and contempt for it; the gospel of love and the gospel of hate and so forth are all mixed up into a coagulated clot of confusion. Heaven help this civilization!

We understand then that 70% of the married women among the English speaking races are widows in wedlock. We know also that the population here indicated includes more than seventy per cent. of the total civilized peoples of the world. The United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa are included in it besides the British Isles; and calculating the speed at which western civilization has advanced during the last quarter of a century we may be prepared for an extension of the percentage to ninety during

the next quarter, and by the end of the twentieth century cent per cent of the unions may prove to be unsatisfactory, unless in the meanwhile wiser counsel prevails and the institution of marriage is reduced to ashes. Fancy, all the married women with contempt for their husbands, calling them boobies, idiots, interminable asses and other vile names, not merely in their hearts, but in every gesture, speech and action. Retributive justice, such as what justifies the belief in the other world according to LordBalfour, will find the higher half of humanity humbled into dust, carrion and vermin. A new civilization will supplant the existing decadent one.

Percentages are less convincing than actual numbers. I shall quote the figures for England from 'Lysistrata' by Ludovici (p. 38) :—

"In 1921 the population of England and Wales amounted to 37,885,242 persons (or thirty eight millions in round numbers) of whom 19,803,022 were females (twenty millions in round numbers). Of this female population 4,302,568 consisted of children under twelve and the remainder amounting to 15,501,454 were divided up as follows.

"9,070,538 were married or widowed or divorced, and 6,403,916 were single."

Applying Dr. Beale's formula to these figures it is clear that 6,349,376 women are widows either in wedlock or out of it. Even research scholars like Katherine Mayo cannot deny that widows out of wedlock are sexually much better off than widows in wedlock. But the actual figures of the two classes of widows are not available. The figures show in the aggregate that out of 15,501,454 women above the age of twelve 12,753,292 are crying for sexual gratification, and most of them probably are crying in vain, whether they are married or unmarried, whether they are advocates of old type morality or scientific morality. Such then is the condition of women in the most highly civilized countries in the world. He hears the cries of more than 90% of adolescent womanhood, who has ears to hear. Katherine Mayo whose heart melts by the wretchedness of semi-civilized women in the east may be shocked into sympathy and charity nearer home by these accounts of civilized women. Let her find husbands (realities, not mere names) for the widows in wedlock, the greatest sufferers of the entire lot. But I forget they have their compensation in feministic achievements, and other

vicarious modes of discharging sexually stimulated nerve-currents, modes which Dr. Macdougall is pleased to call sublimated forms of discharge, or briefly, as "sublimation" or refinement of a vile, turbid current.

It is a most remarkable phenomenon in western civilization that it teaches men and women to love their neighbours' children more than their own. Its success has been largely due to this peculiar psychology. Missionaries crowd over the heathen world while christians at home cease to attend church. Civilized men carry on propaganda work to teach the value of civilization to savages, when savagery is most rampant at home. It is said the Soviet government send missions to India and other countries to teach the value of communism, when capitalism is trying to supplant the mushroom growth in Russia. Civilized capitalists teach African savages the value and dignity of hard labour when socialism is triumphantly reducing the hours of work from 16 to 8, and trying to further reduce it to 4 hours daily. It is said missionaries carry bottles hidden in their bibles. Civilized men carry cartridges in their side pockets. Communists carry the principle of cartel organization in their breast pockets, and capitalists carry *Das capital* under their scalps. There is a Bengali saying that a woman who loves her neighbour's child more than its mother is a witch. It seems there is hidden under this small aphorism truth of a magnitude undreamt of by the wise man who discovered it, or the common man who daily makes use of it to deter kindly feminine nature from owning love for neighbours' children. Indians unreservedly acknowledge their obligations to the critics, who from whatever motive disclose damaging facts calling for reform, though they are packed up in cases loaded with lumber and venom. Western civilization showed its inwardness most conspicuously when it substituted white slavery for black slavery, emancipated Negro slaves in order to turn white men into slaves. Its motive, however, is not inscrutable. It showed no mercy to the Red Indians, when the question of its own advancement was concerned. It showed no mercy to the white proletariat when the same question called for decision. It is a monster of an abstraction, that destroys concrete structures unmercifully in its own interest. Self is the centre round which it gyrates with indiscriminate ruthlessness. It may be guessed that western civilization will never die, though all the civilized peoples may disappear from the face of the earth by killing one another.

THE THIRD EMPIRE : THE EMPIRE OF DIVINITY.

THE UNSEEN WORLD.

The idea of an unseen world existing as a correlate to the world we live in, belongs to the domain of a very ancient faith. The idea invaded the human mind at a time when imagination and perception were much less profoundly differentiated than they are now, and the unseen world was not so very unseen as is now supposed in cultivated thought. The people who lived in that world often visited this, and caused disturbances affecting the routine life of man, sometimes from benevolent, sometimes from malevolent motives, and sometimes without any intelligible motive at all. They sometimes came in groups, but they came for the most part individually. They sometimes operated on a large scale and forcibly drew attention from men. They sometimes gave a shaking to the skies, which we now experience as a storm. They sometimes spoke loudly, specially when shaking the skies. This loud speaking is now known as the phenomenon of thunder. They had large throats wide enough to swallow the moon and the sun, but they could not digest them, and therefore disgorged them under the pressure of nausea. This is known as the phenomenon of eclipse. They could penetrate into the bowels of the earth, and there light a sacrificial fire of granite and brimstone, and they improvised chimneys to let off the smoke and cinders, which are now known to constitute the phenomenon of volcanic eruption. At one time, it is believed in India, they undertook to extract the essence of sea water by the process now known as the churning for butter. The idea was that this essence was the true elixir, capable of bestowing immortality on living beings. The churner was a mountain, and the rope was a python for the indented wheel was unknown. In the process the snake began to vomit poison. The Gods were frightened, and the greatest of them Mahadeo, who was engaged elsewhere in deep meditation was invoked for help. The latter came and swallowed the poison, but it stuck in his throat, and its colour, visible through the translucent skin, added the name of 'Nilkantha' to the mighty deity. The clouds, specially on stormy days, were the locks of hair on Mahadeo's head, unfurled by the cosmic dance of which he is fond in particular seasons of the year, for the purpose of shaking off the water dust which accumulates

in them in the course of his meditations on the lonely hills. This is the meaning of the legend which traces the source of the Ganges to the tangled locks on Shiva's head. Similar to the Ganges on the surface, there is supposed to be a mighty stream in the bowels of the earth, called the Patal Ganga, which forms the perennial source of springs and wells. It is possible the lava which issues out of volcanic craters represents the sludge poured out in the course of dredging operations rendered necessary by the silt which tries to choke up the subterranean stream.

As to the population of the unseen world no census appears to have been taken except the one made by the Hindu mythologists who found that it consisted of the moderate figure of three hundred and thirty millions.

As to the biological species to which the Gods belonged we may refer for evidence to the acknowledged fact that they had no aversion to mortal women in the gratification of their sex appettle which sometimes resulted in heroic issues, in the birth of super men like the Pandavas. But the Gods probably used contraceptives at home, for very few of them are said to have left progeny. The Hindu census which probably gives the optimum number of the population seems consistent with the perfection of divine civilization. It seems divine fecundity fell short of the famous 2.3 prescribed by Herbert Spencer, while the immortality of the Gods may well be challenged by the undeniable fact that the heavens are now nearly desolate and empty. At present there are two or three estimates of the divine population. One counts a family of three with a large entourage of loyal servants. Another finds an absolutely single personality surrounded by loyal servants. In both these cases the servants appear to have for the most part chucked off, and joined their kindreds in the antipodes of the universe preferring freedom in the heat of blazing brimstone. Another account shows that a solitary, absolute, abstract impersonal personality lives as the sole relic of the populous and prosperous city now changed beyond recognition, reduced almost to a skeleton whose sole function seems to be to maintain psychological or metaphysical peace, in their perennial conflict, antagonism and opposition, between the self and the not-self, the logical subject and the object, themselves interdependent, super-intelligible abstractions, fighting a perennial duel in which each threatens to devour the other. (Evolution of

Religion Lecture III by Edward Caird, and Body and Mind by William Macdougall). The situation as is well known to philosophers, is still dubious, though it would appear that the not-self is making rapid progress, drawing the self towards its capacious maw, known as epiphenomanalism. Philosophic animism is in a precarious state weighted by its paraphernalia of immortality and and super-sensibility. Psychology is being inch by inch swallowed by physiology, and the secret of consciousness is being triumphantly traced to vibrations of imponderable matter, ether electrons and protons ; to nerve tissues, stirred and stimulated into dancing phosphorescence. The subject has been more effectively objectified than the object subjectivated. The self has been conquered and enslaved by the Not-self, but not yet completely annihilated. God is already largely relieved of the troublesome duty of reconciling, on equal terms, between the belligerents. The old monism of the Vedanta is being replaced by the monism of Haeckel. Germany, no longer thinks of devouring France and assimilating her slowly and steadily. She is herself half devoured. The entire trend of modern culture is towards the subordination of the subject to the object, of introspection to observation, of a priori reflexion to a posteriori experience. The dignity of human nature is placed at the disposal of external nature. The moral loftiness of man is drowned in the bottomless expansiveness of art, and man finds himself enchained by his own creations. The machine rules man : man does not rule the machine.

TYPES OF GOD.

Four types of God may be distinguished. Animistic Gods are spirits flying about in the skies, who sometimes take shelter in trees and mountains. Mythological Gods have generally the form and colour of men, and their psycho-physical qualities, generally exaggerated and distorted, are distributed among them in different proportions. Some Gods are monstrous in their external form. Some have four heads and some have five. There are Gods and Goddesses who have four arms ; one has ten. There are sometimes mixed bodies ; the lion-man God may be mentioned as the most striking figure among the Gods. Gods were partly formed like men and partly like beasts or birds, even fish. The dwellers of the unseen world had wings,

for balloons and aeroplanes were unknown. One of them had a chariot drawn by horses, for his duties required him to tour round the world every day. When mythology rejects all Gods except one, or at best three, it is called theology. The theological Gods are really mythological, though somewhat advanced in culture. Philosophical Gods are born out of the heads of philosophers, and there are nearly as many such Gods as there are philosophers. In one respect philosophical Gods resemble animistic Gods. They do not permanently take a body, and for the most part live as spirits. This looks like a reversion to the most primitive type, over the heads of the mythological and theological Gods.

All the four types belong to, that is, have their domicile in the unseen world, but their activities run across the frontier of that world, taking their colour and form from the psychophysical environment in which they manifest themselves. Among the rudest savages they prefer the darkness of night to the light of day. Among more advanced people they choose twilight as their work time. None of the types can bear clear light, though some occasionally appear in dazzling or blinding light.

It is futile to try to trace the origin of the Gods, when man does not know his own origin. There are two theories as to how man came into existence. He was either created by one God, the sole God, or he has a beastly origin. Neither explanation is satisfactory to the human intellect, as it exists at the present day.

Did the Gods precede man in origin? Did they come into existence after man? These questions cannot be answered and need not be answered. But it is certain some of the Gods were born subsequent to the appearance of man on earth. Buddha was born in a densely populated world. He believed in no God, whom he regarded as his father. Christ was at the best only an adopted son of this Father. Biologically the Holy Ghost was responsible for his birth and not God the Father. Krishna was born in a world more densely populated still. He lived like an extraordinary man among ordinary men. Christ never definitely declared that he was a God, but he prayed to God the Father like ordinary men. I am not aware if Krishna prayed ever to any God, but at an advanced age he declared that he was God, the sole God, the absolute God, the infinite, the eternal God, though he was only a chauffear of one of the combatants in the great war of Kurukshetra. Mohamed

never pretended to be a God, and though not actually worshipped he receives more sincere adoration from his followers than either of the other three. He was a prophet, a God-man. The other three may be called man-gods I am not aware if any other God commands more respect from men, or respect from more men.

The most primitive Gods were very simple folk. Gods have developed from homogeneity to hetrogeneity like the living beings of this earth. They have developed with the intelligence of man. There is a close relationship between the character of the Gods and the civilization of the men among whom they appear, either bodily or spiritually. This raises the suspicion that the Gods are creatures of the human intellect or of some psychical faculty of man. Rajah Ram Mohon Roy was the creator of his own God. This God is not the God of the Vedanta. He is not one of the Gods of the Puranas. He is not God the father of the Bible. He is not Allah. He is not Jehova. And the Rajah was neither a Prophet nor a Messiah. He never claimed like Krishna to be the sole God. He never claimed to be even an enlightened person like Buddha.

Whatever may be said of the origin of the Gods, they appear to men as embodied world views, simple or complex, partial or complete, embodied in spirits, which may be themselves embodied in flesh. The world of the primitive man is a very limited world, and there may be many things in the world for which he seeks for no explanation. Generally things that happen regularly at intervals do not strike him as things for which an explanation is necessary or desirable. These things he takes for granted. Habit blunts his curiosity. Such things are either beneficial or harmless. They produce neither fear nor pain. We come into contact with the Gods when we are afflicted by the emotions even now. Sri Krishna said it is natural for the diseased and the helpless to invoke a God. The infidel becomes a believer in a storm in the sea. Primitive Gods are limited in their power, and in the scope of their activities, because the experiences of the primitive man are limited. Primitive Gods are, however, developed into more complex and comprehensive ones with the progress of human experience and civilization. This makes the actual origin of the Gods so difficult to trace. One God is sometimes transformed into another. Non-aryan Gods in India have in some cases been received into the Aryan Pantheon with modifications. Animistic Gods are anthropomorphised.

Gods explain not only visible and actual phenomena, but also ideal phenomena of which man has no experience. They reward the righteous and punish the vicious, righteousness and viciousness being judged by custom and well formed habits of thinking. The ideals of one age are replaced by the ideals of another, and then the old Gods begin to be suspected of inadequacy and immorality. They cease to be exemplars, and are gradually ignored or consciously turned out of the pantheon, and eventually replaced by new Gods. There is good reason to think that the Jews were polytheists before the time of Moses, who had to pulverise a God made of gold to please Jehova.

I think the view of the world as taken by Moses was the most comprehensive for his time, and the God representing that view is the most complete God of mythology. In place of many Gods Moses had to find one. This God dealt with astronomical, geological biological, economical and ethical phenomena in a way for a thousand years, three thousand years after Moses had discovered him. There have been many Moseses in the world, astronomical, geological, biological and ethical, but none so comprehensive. Newton's discoveries might form the basis of a new astronomical religion, with gravitation as the God and the Principia as the Bible. Nitzsche's philosophy might form the basis of a new ethical God. I suspect it has created a God already. As to the law of natural selection the new biological God, who is rapidly usurping ethics and politics, economics and sociology, is already enthroned in the heart of a large congregation whose apostolic missions are now congruous with the cultured world. Natural selection is an awakward name for a God. It is yet premature to say that a new religion is not growing whose Old Testament will be the "Origin of Species", and whose New Testament, "The descent of man." Pauls and Peters are numerous, and acts and episttes are not wanting. Christ is identified with a number of miracles on the one hand, and the sermon in the mount on the other. The miracles have been discarded already by all sane Christians. The sermon in the mount is now in the melting pot.

The God of monotheism is not a summated, coagulated total of the Gods of mythology. Its organised capabilities are greater than the aggregate capabilities of the latter. It pretends to be infinite, but it is really finite. The finite mind of man can never compre-

hend the infinite soul. It can merely apprehend it. Human knowledge of the monotheistic God is necessarily more imperfect and self-contradictory than the knowledge of mythological Gods. The latter do not pretend to be friendly among themselves, or to be always in the habit of acting in concert. They sometimes violently rush against one another. There is only one monotheistic God so far mythologically discovered in the world. That God is the God of the Jews. Christanity and Islam have borrowed their Gods from the Hebrews. Each of them has imported its own orientation to the God. Islam does not believe in the son or the holy ghost. Satan and his legion are retained. The Christian God has been nationally oriented throughout the countries of Europe, specially since the days of Luther and Protestantism. Evidence may be found of this orientation in the history of the great war, in which all the important christian countries took part. The existence of Satan deprives these two gods of their absolute monotheistic character. With him they fight not occasionally but perennially. As a world view Satan occupies a larger place than seither of them does. Man worships him heartily, though he pretend to hate him. But hating is a mode of worshipping.

The rudiments of philosophy entered into the conception of the Christian God, and proliferated it into a trinity, as if the unseen world were like the equation $X^2 - 4X + 3 = 0$, which has two roots namely, one and three, either of which satisfies it. Islam cut off the son and the holy ghost to simplify it, but could not extinguish the devil, who with his legion appears as the moral correlate of God, quite as powerful in his sphere of activity as the latter. Taking a broad view of history the devil appears to have played a greater and more important part than God. As an embodied world veiw, God and Allah are both wofully imperfect from the monotheistic point of view. This is all the more to be regretted as Jehovah possessed the characteristic elements of the devil's nature in full measure, and there was no necessity to have a rival. The son was probably necessary to make up for the emotional defects of the father, who rashly cursed mankind, and condemned them to the evils of hard labour and over population. If the son had any voice in the decision, he would most probably not have said ditto to the father, and this would have saved him the trouble of coming to this world afterwards to deliver the greatest speech in literature, I mean the sermon in the mount which emphatically declaimed against

the return of evil for evil. This clause in the sermon is not found in the Decalogue, and one of two conclusions is inevitable. Either the son had no hand in the drafting of this famous document or his moral sense had been elevated subsequently. It seems however, that though the dispute between unity and trinity has received colossal attention from the christian world, the dispute between unity and duality had more importance for mankind, and ought to have been settled with a finality of decision, before it was too late.

The trouble of trinity is not unique in christian thought. Hindu metaphysics has created a trinity of a more acceptable character. That trinity is based upon an analysis of the most important facts of life. Creation, regulation and destruction form a complete totality of facts which emphatically call for explanation from the mythologist and metaphysician alike. Hindu metaphysical mythologists have proved superior to Moses, though they too are inevitably inadequate.

The philosophic type of God is not a development of the mythological or theological type. The discovery is made by the intellect without the direct help of the senses. This type may be called the reasoned type, contrasted with the revealed type. It serves no immediate human purpose, and its object is primarily to elevate man as a moral and spiritual being rather than to depress God in his estimation. The object is to create a higher life for man, as distinguished from his practical life, which chiefly consists of the struggle for existence. The practical life is regarded as man's animal life. It shows that he is an advanced brute. Civilization is chiefly concerned with this life. The spiritual life, though it may be helped by civilization, is above it. It presupposes a culture higher than what science can bestow. The spiritual life is peaceful, passionless, quiescent. It sees everything, understands everything, and meddles with nothing. It is a life of contemplation untouched by instincts or impulses. It enjoys intellectual beauty as contrasted with practical utility. It is said to renounce the world in the sense that it is unaffected by the good things of practical life, comforts and praise or blame do not affect this life. If there is any doubt as to the Gods of mythology or theology being embodied world views, there is none concerning the gods of philosophy. They are said to be discovered by philosophers, by men who have studied the inner workings of the universe, the realities that lie behind appearances, the things that are worth knowing for a life that knows no

death, and not merely for a life limited to the struggle for existence, struggle for power and leadership, struggle for fame and honour, struggle for happiness and comforts.

In the contemplation of the God of philosophy man tries to transcend the limitation of animal life, and ceases to be troubled by hunger and lust, by search for gold and woman, by jealousy and indignation, by the will to power and dominance. He studies the processes by which the world advances or recedes in the greatness of animal life, and even feels a sort of divine pride in the fact that while he lives in the mud of mundane life he is unsoiled by it. He purifies his self by meditative sublimation, and feels like a lump of butter, which the milk out of which it is churned cannot touch. He feels as if he had ceased to be either subject or object, knower or the known, but had become knowledge itself. This is the perfection of religious contemplation. But the actuality seldom reaches the ideal. God himself is knowledge. He is the truth, the absolute, the eternal, the infinite, the sole reality. Final absorption in reality is the destiny of man, who by a mysterious cosmic process, by the frolic of *maya* lives for a time in the turbid lake of reality and appearance, doubt and dogmatism, in the confusion of negation and affirmation, reason and passion, free will and determinism, knowledge and illusion.

What is called the struggle for existence in the animal world assumes in the spiritual world the form of a struggle for purgation, purification, edification, sublimation, beautification and glorification. The beauties and enjoyments of a contemplative life are inaccessible to ordinary men, because it is lived in the fine atmosphere of the spiritual world.

The spiritual empire is divided into two provinces, one bristling with truth, and the other leavened with love. Beneficent activity, search for ultimate truth and uncorrelated love are the three gates by which man can enter his real home, the mansion of infinite pleasure untouched by pain, of eternal truth untouched by illusion, of universal love untouched by hate. The god of philosophy is approached through a struggle, a friendly rivalry between malleable thought and ductile language, each of which tries to transcend the other. It was thus that Uddalaka Aruni was enabled to say "Thou art that". And Krishna said "I am He". These ideas transcend

by many million miles the image of God in man, which looks like the nebulous image in a camera-obscura.

India is pre-eminently the land of gods. All the four types of god exist in profusion in this counrty. Besides the three hundred and thirty million mythological gods animistic gods abound in the hills and jungles of the Vindhya range, specially in Chhotonagpur, where the forests, mountains, sylvan streams and glades give them shelter, and where there is no high education to chase them out. Philosophic gods are as numerous as the Shadhus and Sanyasis, of whom more than a hundred thousand were enumerated at the last census. There was no theological god in India until the first quarter of the nineteenth century, when Rajah Ram Mohan Roy, to all intents and purposes, created one out of the confused congestion of materials packed up in the Vedas, the Bible and the Koran. There are also anthropomorphised animistic gods and mythologised philosophic gods in this country in the same way as there are mixed castes and pure castes.

None of the four types of god are found in their original purity at the present day. The animistic gods retain their purity better than the other gods. The reason is obvious. Culture has not made much progress among their devotees and adherents. Christian and Islamic missions are scattered among them, and reduce the animistic population by decoying numbers of men and women, but they leave the character of the gods untouched. The contact with mythological gods has very probably transformed some of them by the process known as anthropomorphisation, but these transformed gods transfer their domicile into the mythological pantheon, sometimes carrying with them a number of their adherents. Hinduism is not a proselytising religion, but its contact with animism still brings into its fold more men and women than christanity and Islam do by their direct allurements. However this process is declining in power and extension. Missionaries convert men and women to Christanity. The Hindus convert the animistic Gods to Hinduism.

Mythological gods, including theological gods, now seem to have only a permissive right to life. Without the support of the god of metaphysics or philosophy their life is precarious. The Christian god has added to his longevity at the expense of power by submitting himself to terms imposed by the gods of philosophy

He has taken shelter in apologetics, preferring surrender to the gods of philosophy rather than be smothered by science and public opinion or poisonous atmosphere.

In India some of the mythological gods are evidently anthropomorphised animistic gods. The most advanced ones, that is, those that receive most attention and devotion have either issued out of the Vedantic god, the absolute monistic god, contaminated by *Maya*, or are improved editions of pre-existing mythological gods with interpolations and annotations derived from philosophy. In the natural order of time mythological gods have precedence over the gods of philosophy. In India some of the chief mythological gods have issued out of the power which the infinite eternal, absolute God possesses to assume finite forms at pleasure to incarnate Himself when necessary, and take part in human affairs as if they were men or at best supermen. The puranas are connected with the Vedanta. If the Christian god is troubled by a quadratic equation the gods of Hinduism easily face the enigma of an equation of the nth degree.

The desire to identify the impersonal spirituality of philosophy with the personality of the monotheistic god has resulted in inextricable confusion, similar to what exists between ether and matter. Ether, they say, is imponderable matter, and matter is ponderable ether. Thought is hammered by spiritual reflection, and language is heated by divine enthusiasm. What is called the refined religion of philosophers is the result of this heating and hammerring. The Hindu philosopher finds his Saktaism and Vaisnavism residing in the heart of Vedantism, and the Christian philosopher finds the absolute God in Jehova.

The endeavour to assimilate the Christian God to the God of philosophy does not elevate the former, but serves to expose his weakness and irrationalities. Dogma loses its power when encountered by doubt. Revelation loses its driving force when faced by reason. Revelation is meant for the edification of the primitive mind. Reason belongs to the cultured soul. Intuition, while it proves the inadequacy of reason, reduces revelation to an absurdity. Revelation is another name for miracle, and miracle is opposed to science, which combines sense perception with reflective reason. The result is that we sometimes see a philosophic Christian presenting the absurd spectacle of the frightful skeleton of

religion, which rejects the Book of Genesis, the miracles of Christ and the sermon in the mount, which rejects alike Roman Catholicism and the thirty-nine articles at the same time.

There are philosophic Christians who having read the six systems of Hindu philosophy and admired them heartily for their lofty ideas cannot persuade themselves that they are superior to those which underlie Christian dogma. These loftier ideas are of very recent origin, and are not in reality helpful to Christ, but crucify Him covertly, and with greater effectiveness than the Jews did at Calvary. Fortunately for official Christianity reverence for Christian doctrines divested of faith in its dogmatic revelations is not widespread. But researchful reason coaxing and hoaxing revelation has already begun to empty the Churches and Chapels by its underground influence.

NATURE AND SUPERNATURE.

'Nature' is a monstrous equivoke. It includes beings as well as laws. Supernature carries in its bosom the ideas of lawlessnes, that is, of wild freedom, which man exalts as unintelligible freedom, a coagulated mixture of beneficent and maleficent activities. The unmotivated activities of Supernature arouse no interest in man, and therefore form no subject of passionate study. As regards external nature, all its activities are now considered to be unmotivated ; but it is precisely this absence of motive that makes the study of nature so interesting and so useful.

When we speak of human nature we unconsciously exclude the idea of free will. Man is a combination of nature and supernature. He has a natural body and a supernatural mind, particularly a supernatural will. The gods of mythology have a larger ingredient of supernature in their constitution. This excess of supernature leads to the illusion that the gods belong to a different species of beings. They can resemble men, if they will, in body and mind. But their general behaviour shows that they are supermen, or men of a superior type. They have a stronger physique, a finer intellect, a more copious fund of emotions, existing in a more

intense form, and a freer will. Every god is like, yet unlike another, as everyman is like, yet unlike another. The Gods are subject to all the six passions, *viz.*, lust, greed, anger, illusion, inebriation (undue enthusiasm) and jealousy. In these passions too they maintain their superiority, as undoubtedly they maintain in the higher springs of action. What puzzles man is the apparent lawlessness of the combination of the opposites, such as love and hate, kindness and cruelty, veracity and mendacity, integrity and deceit, and so forth which characterise the gods. This combination exists in man also, but there its glare is lost in the environment with its discriminative light and shade ; the environment in which men move, live and have their being is more completely known than the environment in which the gods manifest their multifarious activities, and that accounts for much of the illusions which characterise our feelings about the character of the gods.

The gods of mythology were supermen in the sense in which the word seems to be used by Nietzsche, propounder of the theory of superman, as indicating a certain moral condition most conducive to human advancement, and human elevation. It is probable that the moral principles of the gods subconsciously existed in his mind, and that he felt the necessity of inventing a new word because the gods living in primitive times lacked the intelligence and culture of civilized men, and therefore of potential supermen. Supermen will live in the future ; the Gods lived in the past.

The superman does not measure the worth of things according to pleasure and pain. Sympathy with suffering has dwarfing influence upon character. It really seems that we would rather have sufferings increased, and made worse than it has ever been. Well-being is not a goal. The idea that it is an end makes man ludicrous and contemptible, and makes his destruction desirable. The discipline of great suffering has produced all the elevations of humanity hitherto. In man creature and creator are united. There are higher problems than problems of pleasure and pain and sympathy. Love of adventure, sharpened and fastidious curiosity, subtle, disguised will-to-power and universal conquest these constitute the propulsive forces of human elevation with adequate lubrication by the 'devil'. Have not all gods been sanctified, rebaptised devils ? The current modern philosophy is tedious and soporific. A will to the denial of life, a principle of dissolution and decay underlies the current

type of morality. "Life is essentially appropriation, injury, conquest of the weak suppression, severity, obtrusion, incorporation and exploitation."

These are the characteristic ideas of the morality of the superman. They are precisely the principle of morality followed by the gods of India, Greece and Rome.

Professor Wundit adopts a tone of disparagement in dwelling on the morality of the gods, which is "in many respects quite the reverse of human ideals. Man sees in the gods an exaggeration of his own qualities, the bad included. They are not merely models of courage and justice and the other virtues on which the *common weal* depends, but are equally great in cunning, deceit, violence and sensuality. "*Common weal* is a comparatively new idea. If this idea ruled from the first society would have remained on a low level of life and life elevating efficiency. The weal of a small part at the expense of the multitude, is the true objective of purposive activity. This has been the objective from the anthropological age, through all history, and it will continue to be the objective to the end of eternity unless human stupidity sincerely craves for social equality, and not as it does now, with a deep touch of hypocrisy and deceit."

Evolution depends upon this differentiation of parts, effected by natural or supernatural selection. Struggle for existence between equals would result in the annihilation of both the beliigerents, and would make selection impossible.

Nietzsche, like a true evolutionist, a contemporary of Darwin, divides morality into two types, namely, master-morality and slave-morality. The greeks divided society into citizens and slaves, and mankind into Greeks and barbarians. The Romans divided society into patricians and plebians, and also between citizens and slaves. In India the division was between Aryans and non-Aryans, between Suras and Asuras. The Suras were the gods. They practised master-morality. Their wars with the Asuras had for their object either the annihilation of the latter or the imposition of slave-morality upon them. The best among them preferred annihilation, but the majority adopted slave morality. Their descendants are now known as the depressed classes.

Herbert Spencer being a staunch evolutionist could not fail to make a similar division of morality. Nothing offended him

more than the progress of socialistic ideas in England, for socialism leads to equality, homogeneity, stagnation and degeneration. The factory labourer must have a different morality from the capitalist. The coloured people of the new world must have a different morality from the white colonists. The whiteman has strictly followed these dual principles of morality with the result that the Red Indians have been annihilated, and the Negroes enslaved.

Herbert Spencer as a good philosopher, was not blind to a third type of morality, namely the morality to be practised between equals, that is, between men of the same nature, men of equal culture, men of the same way of thinking.

The divided, mutilated, truncated system of morality is vitiated by the fact that between absolute equality and absolute inequality there is a large borderland of an indeterminate nature. Error of calculation may lead to disaster. Germany exercised master morality when she sent her armies through Belgium on their way to Paris, where they were designed to impose slave-morality upon an entire nation. The result is well known. The treaty of Versailles reversed the process with grim reality.

The secret of the confusion lies in the error which fails to distinguish between the individual personality and the collective personality. Greatness now belongs to the latter. The individual looks sadly small in the presence of the group. It is not a Napoleon or a Kaiser that now counts. The struggle for existence between individuals goes unnoticed. It is the struggle between group personalities that absorbs attention, *e.g.*, the struggle between capital and labour, between man and woman, between religion and science, between nation and nation, or between one civilization and another.

Biologically the gods were men. They belonged to the same species. The most convincing proof of this theory lies in the sexological fact that their connection with mortal women was fertile. The issues were generally supermen. The Pandavas were undoubtedly supermen, if supermen ever existed in this world. They have contributed to the national pride of the Hindus more than philosophers, metaphysicians, poets, architects and saints. There is no record of any man having sexual connection with a goddess. Perhaps it was believed that the issue of such a connection would be a monster. A higher caste man may have sexual connection

with a lower caste woman, but a lower caste man cannot have connection with a higher caste woman. It may be supposed the gods were men above the Bramhins. But a true Brahmin is supposed to be higher than the gods, as a class. Among the gods themselves there was gradation of rank. The greatest of the gods (devas) is Mahadeo. He did not take part in divine politics. That was left to Indra and other gods. Under the law of rebirth it is supposed that an exchange of population perennially takes place between the two worlds, the seen and the unseen. Meritorious men go to the latter, and gods who have had their fill of divine amusements come down to this world. Gods of a saintly temperament become Bramhins. Warlike gods become Kshattriyas, *i.e.*, they are born in a Bramhin or a Kshattriya family. Hypercritical discussion may arouse scepticism and destroy the gods and the unseen world together. It is possible the unseen world was in the heart of the Himalayas, and the present hill stations seem to be a subconscious imitation of the cities of the gods. There were many such cities such as baikuntha, golokdham, etc. The gods are admired for their *Raja gun*. The Brahmins are revered for the predominance in their constitution of *Satwa*. Ultimate absorption in Brahma, the quiescent universal soul, presupposes life in a Brahmin family. Hindus are said to be a decadent race. Among the Hindus the Brahmin's fall is the most deplorable. He has fallen from above the gods to the profession of cooking. At the present day when a man says that he wants a Brahmin, he means he is in need of a cook.

Another proof of the theory that Gods are supermen is furnished by Dietetics. The same kind of food supplies nourishment for both men and god, and the same selective conduct is observable in both. Seeds, grains, fruits, vegetables and flesh all agree with their digestive and assimilative system. Thus likes and dislikes are nearly of the same nature in this important affair of life. Some gods prefer animal food, without discarding agricultural and horticultural products. Others are exclusively vegeterians and fruitarians. Among fruits banana is a general favourite. As regards animal food the gods of love prefer milk and clarified butter. The gods of strife relish flesh, cooked or uncooked. Krishna insisted on ghee even at the risk of running into debts. It is remarkable the goddesses had extreme preference for flesh, while their husbands were vegeterians. The chief deity of strife is a Goddess. Feminism is opposed in the western countries at the present day chiefly on the

ground that women cannot fight, and it is unwomanly to take part in war and strife. Anti-feminists may take a lesson from Hindu mythology.

Among animals, goats, sheep and buffaloes are specifically selected. Beef is forbidden food for the gods. The gods detest birds as comestibles. The gods of strife drink wine. They do not refuse alchol. The tantrics offer this drink copiously. Fish was detested by the gods. Its presence is nauseating except to one god, to whom it is offered burnt or smoked. The gods are averse to any but fresh meat, sacrificed in their presence. Diseased animals or animals with ulcers or incised wounds are rejected. The gods are meticulous about hygiene.

Cooked food is sometimes offered. It is acceptable only when a Brahmin has cooked it. It is possible the profession of cooking was adopted by the priestly caste, because they had acquired a special aptitude by cooking for the gods.

In the matter of food the gods seem to be non-progressive. The Hindus have ceased to eat the flesh of the biuffalo, but the gods relish it still. The Hindus eat ducks and chickens. But the gods continue to detest them. The Hindus eat leavened bread, but the gods do not like it, probably because it is baked by Mussalmans. Hindu-*roti* is improving in quality and the gods may accept it soon. But unfortunately the gods are decadent or degenerate, and innovations in food, morals, manners encounter great opposition.

It will appear from what has been said that the gods are physically, psychologically, ethnologically and biologically identifiable with men. As to racial traits it appears that the present god population is a mixed population. There are aryan gods and non-aryan gods, and gods of a hybrid type. The aryan gods are white in their skins. The non-aryan gods are dark. But the chief deities are blue. Kali, Krishna and Rama belong to this colour. Various theories may be propounded as to the colour of the gods, who seem to be more liberal and compromising than the Aryans who refused to mix intimately with the non-aryans. Poetic explanations are not of much use for pragmatic purposes. Rama-Krishna told Keshab that Krishna looked blue to those who were most remote from him. Nearness to the gods turns their colour into complete brightness. The distant sky is blue, but the surrounding atmosphere is bright.

The wife of Siva is the handsomest goddess in the Hindu pantheon. She rode a lion and fought the asuras. She is identified with Kali, the dark skinned. The latter also fought the asuras and wore a garland of human heads. It is easy to suppose her to be a non-aryan goddess for the colour of her skin. But it is difficult to reconcile this theory with the fact that she killed the non-aryans like an apostate. The human heads of which her garland is composed are black. My object, however, is to give a general view of the gods, and not to present a complete picture. The conjecture that before she was incorporated into the aryan pantheon she belonged to a black race, which was hostile to another black race, and that the aryans incorporated deity and devotee together, as a good auxiliary for the purpose of exterminating the more stubborn race, is plausible. The polytheistic gods are a decadent race, decimated apparently by the monotheistic deity. The gods of Greece and Rome have disappeared. Christanity rules these now. In the Islamic world also Allah seems to have massacred them. It is in India alone that inspite of Islamic and Christian invasions the gods still do flourish, though decadence is palpable. The cause of this decadence lies elsewhere and not primarily in the Koran or the New Testament, though these are creating new problems for politicians, not for religious pragmatism.

As regards the clothing of the gods much is not known. Siva covers his loin with a tiger skin. His wife Kali is nude. But Durga is fully dressed in silk. Krishna did not spend much on his clothing in his youth. He misappropriated a cloth from a laundry on the way to a festival at Kangsa's house. The washerwoman obtained salvation for not resisting the theft. The Apsaras wore fine cloths. Women also covered their bodies decently in Krishna's youth. He stole a number of clothes belonging to women at the bathing ghat.

I shall now briefly dwell on the character of the one God, the God of monotheism, who is distinguished from the polytheistic Gods by the capital 'G' as the initial. But, one or many, a God is a person, albeit a superperson, who carries in sovereign exaggeration the character and intelligence of man. He has good and bad qualities judged by our present mode of adjuducation. There is probably a preponderance of good, but the matter is undecided, as men are becoming increasingly indifferent. The oneness of God gives him no advantage in the matter of character. It is rather a source

of evil. It makes him a despot, arbitrary, stubborn, contemptuous, fearless. He has none to consult, none to depend upon, none to trust, and none to help Him in difficulty. He exposes a broad side to critics who pick holes through which his defects pop out, remarkably the defect of self-contradictoriness.

He remains finite all his life despite all our endeavour to attribute infinity to him. He reveals himself to the senses, as contrasted with Reason and Imagination. The supposition that the infinite and the finite are different forms of the same being does not improve divine character. The infinite can transform himself into the finite without offending Reason. But the finite cannot similarly transform himself into the Infinite. Some people regard finitude of God as a mere divine pretence. But camouflage more appropriately belongs to the Devil. The monotheistic God sees more than his polytheistic compatriot, but He does not see all. He is not omniscient. Neither is He omnipotent, or omnipresent. These and other perfections of abstraction collide with one another and are mutually destructive. One need not read the discussion of Mill or any other learned infidel for the purpose of discovering the truth. Commonsense is enough. But common sense has the weakness, as I have said elsewhere, of melting into nonsense at the high temperature of controversy. Hence wisdom suggests the avoidance of all religious controversies.

Buckle was of opinion that the character of man does not change from age to age. He was probably wrong. But it seems that the character of the gods does not change quickly. At least it has ceased to change for many centuries. The pluralistic gods are dead in most countries. Two successive plagues have turned the unseen world into a desert. These are otherwise called the advent and the hijira. In India the gods exist still, but they are rapidly declining. They are moribund now, and have long ceased from active life. They no longer respond to stimulus, and stimulus is ceasing to be applied. Both the plagues have raged and are still raging in this country. But they have lost their original virility and virulence. The general atmosphere of the world has improved, and plagues and pestilences are fast disappearing in the spiritual world as well as in the physical world under the influence of science.

The god of monotheism revealed himself only in one spot of the world, namely in Syria. He revealed himself to Moses who was

once allowed for a moment to see His back, but who was priveleged to hear his voice and to listen to his account of creation, the creation of light and life, air and water, rocks and soft clay. He told him about the creation of man and his wife in paradise, whence they were expelled on ac.ount of a vital but accidental act of disobedience, which he resented so bitterly that he was not satisfied until he had turned them out, and condemned them to hard labour, insufficient food and over-population in an island which resembles Andaman. His vision was limited and his passions and appetites were strong. One day He was pleased with one of the two sons of Adam, and on the next he was surprised to miss him, for he had been murdered by his brother, who when asked returned an offensive evasive reply, and was cursed very severely. The fertile clay of the subsoil was turned into hard rocks which refused to respond to the stimulus of the spade and the hoe. The criminal, however, remained obdurate, and turned his spade and hoe into sword and lance, and adopted brigandage as his profession. This god was ruthless, relentless and despotic. He made his curses hereditary and fixed no limitation of time. He gave no opportunity to his immediate victims to apply for a revision of his orders. He never mitigated them, but rather made them accelerative. The effect was that the entire population of the world would be suffering till the end of eternity, but for defiant civilization which has rescued a small fraction of humanity by increasing the burdens of the majority. The most charitable view of the phenomenon is that God was lacking in foresight. He never vouchsafed to Moses any intimation regarding his purposes in creating this world, and his motive in abandoning it to the domination of Satan so soon after creating it, or as to why he made no serious attempt to restore it to his own absolute rule. He sent his son no doubt to reconquer the world, but it was too late, for civilization had already advanced far, and the devil's dominion was well consolidated. The arrival of the son was private, because he was afraid of mischances. His departure was public and attended with supernatural pageantry, though he had failed to accomplish his mission and to re-establish the kingdom of his father. He was crucified shortly after he had entered upon the campaign, but being convinced that there was no chance of success he warned his followers on the eve of his departure that he would come a second time. Robert Bruce succeeded at the thirteenth attempt. No body knows how many times Christ will come.

Krishna has come ten times, and may come again without much effect. Perseverance is a good quality, but Christ did not exhibit this quality in a great measure. Buddha preached for sixty years ; and everybody had time to know the worth of his personality. The son of god paid what may be called a flying visit only, as if he were afraid of betraying unexpected weaknesses of character by prolonging it. But it is universally admitted that he was a great soul, so far as the short campaign gives glimpses of his character. His failure must, therefore, be attributed to his father's shortcomings. There is nothing in the Bible to show that Christ was recalled home by more urgent business elsewhere, or on account of illness, and yet no reinforcement was sent to him during the campaign, which lasted for more than a year according to the best calculation. The inference is that he had come inadequately equipped like Sir Redvers Buller, who went with a return ticket to the South African war. But in whichever way we look at the matter we feel disappointed at divine inadequacy, mental deficiency and moral mediocrity.

This god now rules more than half the area of the world, and a third of its population. The Chinese with a quarter of the population are Confucians and Buddhists. The Hindus with about a sixth part of the population retain their old pantheon, reduced and modified. The adherents of Allah are nearly as numerous as the Hindus. The rest of the world follow animistic and metaphysical gods of various shades and colours. All metaphysical gods are advanced animistic deities. The Jews form a comparatively small scattered community. They did not accept Christ as the Messiah, but were condemned to live among Christians as a hateful people, fit only to be exploited and massacred. They are now shining in the industrial and political world, but this position they have acquired by submitting to conversion to Christianity, which they disdained to accept from Christ personally, who was sent to them by god because he regarded them as his favourite people.

The most civilized people of the world call themselves Christians, but Christ would be ashamed of a majority of them if he came a second time. They have triumphed more by defying than by following his precepts. They rule the world in a manner, but they do not owe their ruling power to Christ. It may be most appropriately said that the Christian god has gained the world and lost

His soul. It is not at all pleasant to dwell on the present enigmatic condition of either God or Allah. Both wanted to raise mankind from the mire of the visible, into the melodious and fragrant atmosphere of the invisible world. They have turned the mire into a quagmire, and the most humiliating thing for them is that while men are in reality following the devil they uproariously proclaim that they are deeply attached to Allah or God.

The truth seems to be that the monotheistic God seems to be less acceptable to civilized Reason than the polytheistic gods. He may satisfy the emotion of the individual very well by lopsided presentations, but taken in His totality He is an incoherent agglomeration, a vast and divergent plurality labouriously camouflaged into a unity. I am not referring to the trinity, a superfluous idea which could be dispensed with without detriment to the father, without weakening him by a particle. Neither the Holy Ghost nor the son has any function apart from what might rationally belong to the father. No doubt the son incarnated himself to redeem the world, but there is no reason why the father could not have incarnated Himself for the same purpose. There are full incarnations and partial incarnations in Hindu mythology, and in the case under consideration either kind was possible. Rama was a partial incarnation. Krishna was a complete incarnation. Christian mythologists seem to be overpowered by arithmetical difficulties which made no impression on Hindu mythologists. Krishna was a full incarnation, but a part of the deity was simultaneously incarnated in Balaram. The infinite cannot be finite in full. He can be infinite and finite at the same time. He could easily pluralise his finite forms.

Divine government might well get on without the son, and so could inflict punishment or bestow rewards without the pleadings of the latter. The holy ghost might similarly be dispensed with, leaving the father alone to look after the affairs of the universe unaided by co-ordinate or subordinate co-operation. Assistance was present in plenty in the loyal angels serving in heaven with as great loyalty and affection after the Heavenly Armageddon as before it. But the case of the disloyal angels who had broken from God, and set up an independent sovereignty is different. God and these angels stand in opposition like Ormuz and Ahriman of Zoraster. The truth is this Persian duality has a reality which cannot be

ranscended by the intellect of man, however much he may try to deceive himself or however hard he may train or strain his will-to-believe.

The significance of the heavenly Armageddon has never made a deep impression on the conscience of the devout Christian with his truncated intelligence. It has increased reverence for his military power, tactics and manœuvre ; but it has weakened his reputation for tactfulness, business capacity, foresight, and power of management. It has thrown a lurid light on his character and exposed his anthropomorphic psychic character, and obliterated the distinction between supernature and human nature. The fall of man followed soon after the Armageddon ; and God instead of trying to prevent this catastrophe showed qualities of head and heart which would make the throne of an earthly tyrant precarious ; and when it is remembered that he allowed three thousand years to pass before he took any action for the benefit of man, it is hardly possible for a reasonable creature to love Him at heart. When further it is remembered that what he did for the redemption of man was a half hearted expedition headed by the Heavenly Prince of Wales, he feels himself prepared for hell, rather than disposed to loyalty to such a one. And this has happened after all.

I reproduce below what the poet James Thompson, born Christian, felt regarding the Christian God :—

"Who is most wretched in this dolorous place ?
I think myself ; yet I would rather be
My miserable self than He,
Who formed such creatures to his own disgrace.

The vilest thing must be less vile than those
From whom it had its being, God and Lord !
Creator of all woe and sin ! abhorred,
Malignant and implacable ! I vow.

That nor for all thy power, furled and unfurled,
For all the temples to Thy glory built,
Would I assume the ignominous guilt
Of having made such man in such a world."

I need not take a census of the Thompson family. Perhaps it is not very populous, for Thompson was a genius. The thinness of population is not due to the increased diffusion of reverence for God, but to indifference. Science has deprived God of His freedom of will, his arbitrariness, His power to do good or evil against the laws of nature, His power to burn people alive, or to send them to blazing brimstone after death. All supernatural powers, in short, his very existence, have been transferred to nature, who has no character, either moral or immoral, and has therefore no reputation either to lose or to gain. She does not worry about man's happiness or misery. Her laws work unceasingly, without sympathy or cruelty, without in fact taking any account of such vermin as man. The Book of Genesis receives no reverence ; nor does the sermon in the mount. Miracles are intended for the amusement of noodles and molly-coddles. Man no longer thinks of establishing a kingdom of God on earth. His ideal is a kingdom of abundance and freedom, where nature will act as maidservant, all her muscles and nerves being devoted to the production of the good things of life. This is an excellent ideal, except for the fact that the human family is divided against itself by patriotism and nationalism, and every nation wants to have the services of the maid servant not only for its own benefit, but for the defeat and humiliation of all neighbouring nations. It wants the creative powers of nature for its own advancement, and her destructive powers for the subjection and enslavement of neighbours.

That God is identified with the devil, or is at least a suspect, is evident from the prayer, "Lead us not into temptation." The idea of tempting children can never be righteously or rationally associated with the functions of a loving father, who is also beloved.

THE EMPIRE OF DIVINITY.

I shall conclude this section by briefly adverting to the character of the Gods of philosophy or metaphysics. These Gods are in most respects different from the Gods of mythology (theology is virtually, a branch of mythology.) The psychology which created these Gods, that is, brought them before mankind is in direct antagonism

with the one which created the other three types of God. Resemblance between man and God characterises the underlying principle of the latter psychology. Dissemblance between man and God to the point of conflict and opposition, and not mere contrast, lies at the root of the former. Man is finite, God is infinite. Man is mortal, God is eternal. Man is conditioned, God is absolute. Man is changeful, God is immutable. Man has a mixed character, God is pure. Man is appearance, God is reality. Man has passions, emotions and impulses ; God has none of these. Man is pugnacious, God is peaceful. Man is bustling, God is quiescent. Man is subject or object ; God is subject and object combined, or beyond them. It is not my purpose here to enumerate all the attributes of God, for that is impossible. A consistent statement of his attributes has never been prepared. It has sometimes been attempted. It is enough to say man is comprehensible, God is incomprehensible. The best argument in favour of the existence of God is that the world is limited, while there exists a universal desire in man to know the unlimited. Even veteran agnostics do not deny the existence of this desire. Man is not satisfied with the limited. He revolts against his own limitations. The result of that revolt or divine discontent is an encyclopaedia of philosophy, an interminable wrangling of philosophers, an unsuccessful attempt to see the invisible, to know the unknowable, to comprehend the incomprehensible, to compass the uncompassable.

God as thus originally apprehended had no intelligible practical relation to human life. Man therefore wanted to establish a tangible relationship with God, to hold communion with him, and to pray to him for benefits, material and spiritual, in his helplessness. But since God would not come to him, he thought he would himself fly to Him. For this purpose he divided himself into two parts, body and soul. The body could not fly to God ; so it was to be cut off and left behind. In dream the soul separates itself from the body. It was capable of being separated when awake. The body, that is, the senses could not perceive God, but the soul could. This division of the soul and body is nearly universal. But there is no agreement among philosophers as to what part of our psychical structure constitutes the soul or self. In the Vedanta the mind (*mana*) is not self. It is upadhi. The emotions and passions are also part of *upadhi*. But it is claimed that the self when fully freed from the not-self (*upadhi*)

identifies itself with God. It is thus that man meets God, becomes absorbed in Him, and resumes his real primal character.

The idea is grand. But the question how the self can be freed from the not-self has never been solved. There can be no empirical solution, and those who have freed themselves can not come back to communicate to man the process by which they freed themselves. That is the difficulty. Death separates the two; but death is destructive. It decomposes the body. Does it keep the soul alive? Or, does it decompose it into its constituent parts, if there are such parts? The answer is, it has no parts, at least no separate parts. What is its function standing by itself? If it is pure, how came it to be entangled in impurity or sin? Why was it thus entangled? Has it free will? Has it consciousness and memory? If it lives after death, does it leave all the impurities behind, or, does it carry some of them? If it has free will, can it refuse to be re-incarnated? If it lives, where does it live? What does it do there? Does it only enjoy or endure, without any power to enhance its enjoyments or to mitigate its sufferings? These and a hundred and one other questions press upon the philosopher, and press very hard. He tries to evade them, and takes shelter in the plea of unenlightenment. How is light to come? Is it expected to come from outside, or is it likely to emerge out of the depths of the soul? But the soul has no depth, because it has no parts?

The practical mind does not worry about these things. It has no stomach for tortuous curves of dialectics. It wants to know directly what the nature of salvation is, and how it can be attained. The final salvation is a merger. The individual soul is merged into the universal soul, and is lost without any gain any where. At all events God must be realised, known and felt, seen and tasted, with necessary audition and olfaction.

How to realise God, to taste him, as Chaitanya said of Krishna? The way is to do what is most pleasant to him. It must be pleasant for God to be conscious that men have faith in him, that they love him, and love to depend upon him in weal and woe. This faith presupposes knowledge of Him, of His character and of the things in which He takes interest. He evidently takes interest in the continued preservation of living beings and of humanity in particular. He probably also takes interest in the progress of mankind, that is, in civilization and social organization. Salvation then is attained

(1) by knowledge of God and of the things in which he is interested (2) by faith and love and (3) by moral activities. The first is called *Jnan*, the second *bhakti*, and the third *karma* in Hindu philosophy.

These ways of salvation are common to all religions. All the ways are indefinite in character. They are inherently mixed up with one another, though it is supposed that one of them is enough to bring salvation. The mixture which is actually adopted in different religions and at different times is extremely changeful. With the progress of civilization *bhakti* declines. *Jnan* increases, but not in all directions. *Jnan* includes theosophy and science. The taste for theosophy declines and that for science increases, specially where the two kinds of *jnan*, theosophical and scientific, are at variance. In the Christian world theosophy, otherwise called theology, had a hard struggle against science, and has been ultimately defeated. *Jnan* in India was foremost in the vedantic age. It gave way to *bhakti* in the pauranic age. Indeed it is asserted that the Puranas were created to give prominence to *bhakti* above *jnan* which had cultivated the intellect at the expense of the heart and produced an arid spiritual atmosphere, empty, barren and unsatisfying.

Human life is ordinarily divided between animal life and spiritual life. There is a kind of life which is so remotely and thinly spiritual that it seems it would be better to divide life between animal life and superanimal life, spiritual life being a part of this superanimal life.

Animals have no taste for literature, fine arts and philosophy and science. These things therefore do not belong to animal life. They cannot be strictly regarded as manifestations of the spiritual life. It is reasonable to regard them as manifestations of superanimal life. Karma or moral activity belongs to both animal and superanimal life. Animals do not make railway engines or aeroplanes ; they do not light their dwellings with electricity, they do not discuss politics or make laws ; these things helped by *jnan* belong to superanimal life. Strictly speaking animal life is concerned with behaviour towards self, and superanimal life with behaviour towards others, all accessories being included. I repeat then that human life may be divided into animal life and superanimal life ; and superanimal life may be divided into spiritual life

and higher secular life. The inclusion of *karma* in spiritual life seems tortuous, specially in hindu philosophy which requires *karma* to be performed without any utilitarian purpose or without any desire for results. This analysis enables a fairly accurate view of the comparative merits of eastern and western civilization to be taken. Life on the whole is quantitatively larger in the west than in the east. Animal life is very strong in the west. The higher secular life is also superior. Spiritual life is weak, specially that part of it which is concerned with *bhakti*. *Bhakti* existed there in an extraordinary measure among some individuals in the middle ages. It has dwindled towards the vanishing point since the renascence. Theosophy is still discussed, but there is very little heart or seriousness in the discussions. The spiritual life on the whole has a larger place in the east. Theosophy or god-knowledge is real *jnan ;* and is largely diffused among the people. It occupies a higher place in the order of precedence over science and general philosophy. In India God is better known than in any other part of the world. His likes and dislikes form subjects of discussion among all manner of people, and everywhere ; and as his dislikes are stronger than his likes man hesitates to take action, or to exercise his energies without consulting him ; and the result is that *karma* is very limited and weak. Idleness is better than *bikarma*. As to *akarma* it is sheer waste of energy and therefore disliked by God, and whatever is disliked by God must be eschewed by man. Thus the life of *karma* in India is very feeble, and much of the life of *karma* being animal life people are proud of their idleness. In the west people hate idleness because they hate the devil, and everybody believes that the idle brain is the devil's workshop. In India it is supposed that God dwells in the idle brain. Here is a large divergence of character between the East and the West. It is supposed that in the West behaviour towards neighbour is largely of the nature of exploitation. This is true, but the exploitation is discriminative, but not maleficent in all cases or in most cases. One man exploits another not to destroy the latter, but to benefit himself. The dog is exploited for hunting purposes, but the dog receives morsels thrown from the dinner table. That is the kind of exploitation resorted to. It is difficult to estimate the moral value of this exploitation, or to judge whether God is pleased or displeased by it. But the fact is that exploitation constitutes three fourths of the life of western civilization.

The Indian boastfully speaks of his *bhakti*. But the westerner regards it as exploitation of the goodness of God. They think that exploiting a neighbour is much less blameworthy than the exploitation of God. The *ananda* which the devotee feels is the fruit of that exploitation. But God is infinite and his fund of *ananda* is also infinite, so that exploitation does not harm him. Thus defeated the westerner compares the life of *bhakti* to the life of the dog, which is the most faithful animal living in close contact with man. A European philosopher has discussed with much gravity and seriousness whether the dog can claim salvation with man from the hand of God, on account of superhuman faithfulness. The writer probably knows the case of Judhistir's dog who was disallowed admittance at the gate of heaven. Judhistir refused to enter without his dog. The principle was reversed at a Viceroy's levee where a Maharaja with his European manager was told at the gate that the gate was not intended for the coloured people. Here the manager refused to enter.

Bhakti declines with the growth of civilization, and science and art advance. Growth of civilization in the west pre-supposes a harder struggle for existence, and consequently it involves a more expanded system of *karma*. Growth of civilization in the East is considered mischievous if it fails to soften the struggle for existence. *Karma* thus advances faster than *Jnan* in the west. It declines in the East. *Jnan* which helps both *bhakti* and *karma* withdraws its attention from *bhakti* and transfers it to *karma*. Thus theosophy declines and art advances in the West. In the east *Jnan* neglects *karma*, and attaches itself more firmly to *bhakti*. In the west superanimal life expands in the direction of scientific research, utilitarian and aesthetic arts. Eventually theosophy and *bhakti* receive least attention ; and science and art dry them up. The ultimate consequence of expanded *karma* is that man begins to suspect that dependence upon God is unnecessary, and self-sufficiency is cultivated hastily. The individual man cannot be self-sufficient, but society can, and the sense of dependence upon God is transformed into the sense of dependence upon society. The individual loses dignity and value, and society dominates over him. He becomes a slave of politics, a fallen man in the eastern sense.

The God of philosophy living in an atmosphere surcharged with the miasma of anthronomorphic ideas cannot long retain his

subtle, impersonal, inscrutable character, but vulgarises himself in various ways, while his repercussive influence raises the Gods of the other types to a higher level. The mixed Gods thus evolved are at present the rulers of the world. They are worshipped by men who seek communion with them, and pray to them for benefits, which generally form a confused mixture of spiritual and practical advantages. It is true that every educated man creates out of the four types of God a God for himself, but the Gods thus formed are so like one another for a large number of persons that they may be regarded virtually as one God, and their devotees form a congregation or sect. Where the unlikeness is considerable different congregations are formed. When different congregations live in the same society, national life presents difficulties in proportion as men consider their Gods as more important than society. God-loving people find it difficult to advance in civilization.

I have spoken of ultimate salvation as absorption in God or *Brahma-nirvan*. This is the salvation in the philosophic system of unseen life. There are other forms of salvation which belong to the unseen world of mythology. The general idea that runs through them all is that pleasures and sufferings of the kind which man enjoys or endures in this world repeat themselves with deeper intensity in the other. The salvation of woman is not much thought of. Perhaps they are never saved, or have no soul to live after death. For men the highest pleasure in heaven consists in the enjoyment of the dances of houris, *apsaras* and angels accompanied by vocal music. Some souls find pleasure in menial employments in the divine palace. Perpetual repose is perhaps the best form of salvation for those who have passed their lives in this world in hard labour and on sweated bread. Races of men in heaven find continuity of the form of occupation which they have in this world. Thus German hunters of pre-historic times found good hunting grounds with plenty of game in heaven. Cultivators find fine arable lands in abundance. Lawyers find excellent cases to argue. As a matter of fact heaven is a replica of this world, minus the miseries of starvation, disease and unemployment.

But all men are not saved. I might affirm with good reason that most men never find salvation. For three thousand years, according to Christian calculation, no man was admitted to heaven. The doors of that city were permanently shut against them for

disobedience, and this for the theft of an apple. Christ possibly succeeded in removing the fastenings, but himself stood guard at the gate so that no man might enter without a ticket obtained from him. The earnings of this life are intended to meet charges at the Booking Office for the ticket at the gate of heaven, which is like a theatre or circus. Christ keeps an account of all payments. Among the Hindus a clerk named Chitra Gupta presides over the booking office to keep a detailed biographical account, a personal ledger of every human being.

Where do men go when they are not admitted to heaven? Do they come back home? I shall speak of rebirth, elsewhere Most people go to a place which is variously called Hades, Hell, Perdition, *Dojak*, *Narak* and so forth. The early Greeks had no heaven. They went to Hades, one and all of them. This helped their civilization. Naturally, they had the true will-to-live, and they acquired the will-to-power. Without the help of these two wills western civilization could not have advanced so rapidly, and western civilization is Greek civilization re-born. The idea of eternal perdition in the middle ages turned its attention altogether away from the unseen world, and it is now reserved almost solely for the affairs of this world. Western civilization shines in the present because it has no future life. That is the secret of its success. For all forms of unsaved life, unintermittent, intense pain is the general principle of divine treatment. Blazing brimstone, red-hot pokers, pits of night soil, and other kinds of suffering, conceivable and inconceivable, are reserved for the unsaved souls.

Whether they go to heaven or hell all men are treated as criminals and formally tried. They are kept as undertrial prisoners in their graves for a time extending in some cases over thousands of years. Some Mussalmans think that the trial will not begin before the end of the world. For them both heaven and hell are as yet empty places. The trial of the Hindu begins shortly after death. He probably passes sometme as an absconding criminal wandering in arborial dwellings in the expectation that his sons and relations would find food and drink for him ; also intercession at the trial. But whether he goes to heaven or hell he cannot evade rebirth permanently, unless he has obtained ultimate salvation in the Brahmanirvan form. Rebirth is also the lot of the Buddhist.

The ceremony among the Hindus by which absconding suspects and criminals receive their food and drink and forensic intercession from their relations is an important affair in the life of a Hindu. It is called *Sraddha*. Priest-craft exploits it for its own benefit in a country where the belief prevails for sober moments, that the result of the trial entirely depends upon *bhakti*, *jnan* and *karma*, and no amount of forensic help can alter the iudgment. The *Sraddha* is celebrated with great eclat on the 11th, 15th, or 30th day after demise. It is repeated every year and in the majority of cases, Lord Vishnu residing at the Hindu temple at Gaya, receives worship from those who can afford the cost of the journey, and meet the exactions of the Gayali priests. If there is any truth in the efficacy of *pinda* at the *Vishna-pad*, the Hindus must be deeply grateful to their British rulers who have by opening railways, vastly facilitated the journey, and made the visit to Gaya cheap beyond expectation. There are British officers in India who feel grateful to Hinduism for the *pinda*, which brings much money to the treasury through the railways. Visitors come to Gaya from all parts of India, from Rawalpindi to Chittagong, from the Himalayas to Cape Comorin.

As a rule the true Hindu does not remain satisfied until he is convinced that the trial of his father and remoter ancestors has ended favourably at the gate of heaven. He thinks it extremely unrighteous to enjoy his patrimony while his father leads a roving fugutive life from tree to tree expecting a long term of imprisonment in blazing brimstone and bottomless trenching grounds. He sometimes spends on *pinda* the whole of his inheritance, even the greater part of his own independent earnings. If love of ancestors has any meaning it has it in the *Sraddha*. At the present day, however, custom and fear of neighbours are the leading principles of psychology underlying the phenomenon. Even the educated youth who has earned freedom from the superstition of *Sraddha*, cannot defy custom and neighbour openly. He does it covertly, and performs the ceremony somewhere on the banks of the Ganges, where he can escape with a nominal payment. Reverence for parents implies acknowledgement of benefits received from them. Birth is thus considered to be a great benefit in a country where the cessation of rebirth is the ultimate and supreme blessing for man! It requires an intolerable straining of the will-to-believe to swallow all the inanities connected with eschatological life.

THB HUMANISTIC VIEW OF SUPERNATURE.

Of the two propositions 'God made man' and 'Man made God', the second is more intelligible, though there are undoubtedly more men who accept the first proposition as true, and reject the second as blasphemous, if not, as irrational. Actual creation is always preceded by creation in thought, by contemplation of its consequences, its form, its substance, its structure, and its cost. In engineering design, plan and estimate precede construction. The contemplation of consequence is called purpose. Some sort of feeling, generally painful, precede the contemplation. There must be either a practical necessity or an aesthetic desire at the back of every creative act.

Neither mythology nor theology has a cosmology with a rational or intelligible purpose, at the back of it. Theology states in detail how God created the world, but it is silent as to why he created it. Man is neither a necessity nor a beauty and the creation of him is less intelligible than the creation of the rest of the world.

Hindu philosophy indicates that God created the world by mistake, being momentarily under the influence of Maya something which belongs to the feminine gender, universally regarded by man as a corruptive stimulant.

What is ordinarily known as the design theory of creation relates to mere adjustment of the parts. It has nothing to say regarding the creation of the whole. And as regards the adjustment of parts increasing knowledge discloses more facts of maladjustment, of friction, conflict and collison than of coherence, smoothness, stability, harmony and peace.

There are men who sincerely believe or pretend to believe that life is a gift for which man ought to be thankful to God. But they are mere poets, not thinkers or philosophers. They speak of the world as God's house built to find shelter for man. They speak of intense affection with which He tends them. They speak of wheat and meat as made for the delectation of man in the form of cakes and cutlets. They easily discover that flowers are fragrant, the voice of the nightingale is musical, the moon is very beautiful, and sex very attractive. They have no experience of poison, stench, thunder, corpse and venereal disease, tooth ache and indigestion,

unsatisfied hunger and thirst. The good things of life, the sweetness of love, the mango and orange, the rose and primrose, the cuckoo and the nightingale on which they dwell so ostentatiously, pleasantly, assiduously, are rare, and distributed discriminatively to the point of unfairness.

Hindu philosophy is based upon the assumption "that the world, as it is, is surcharged with misery, which can be escaped by renouncing life. Western philosophy is different, It is conscious of the misery, yet inspired by the will to live. The result is exploitation of various kinds, one of which is the exploitation of the weakness of neighbours. God created misery for all. He was probably not discriminative in the beginning. Man has varied the intensity of misery. If God was discriminative from the start all the worse for Him.

How did the Gods come to be known to man ? How did man make their acquaintance ? Did the Gods obtrude themselves upon his attention, or did man feel an inherent thirst for them, seek for them, and discover them by his efforts, for his own advantage or by an inner compulsion ?

The primitive man had no thirst of Gods. He had no apprehension of the unseen world, much less of their character and their attitude towards man. Earthquakes and thunderstorms, volcanic eruptions and natural conflagrations, plagues and pestilences, deaths and diseases, on a large scale introduced Them to him, almost obtruded the Gods upon him. He shuddered at their sight, at their roaring voice, at their greed of blood and flesh, at the human sacrifices, at the hecatombs they celebrated, at the clenched fists which they brandished at them, and at their open intimidations, and he trembled in terror. He knew the lion, the tiger and the ape ; he knew the snake. He had fought them, defeated them and slain them by the power of his muscles and by his cunning. But the new enemies were of a different type. His optimism turned into pessimism. He felt like a coward. He knelt at their feet and surrendered himself unconditionally. He worshipped them, made sacrifices to them, prayed to them and asked for their abstention from deeds of evil.

Man lost much by his new experience, but there were compensatory advantages, which disclosed themselves afterwards.

He largely lost his unreasoned courage, his innate spirit of defiance, his master-morality, his aristocratic mentality, his destructive proclivity and his thirst of conquest and ascendancy among his neighbours. He gained discrimination, sympathy for neighbours in distress, the desire and power of combination, the sense of equality, sameness and fraternity among men, and moral forces which became of great service to him afterwards, in the shape of comparative peace, leisure and opportunities for acquiring knowledge, self-preservative, self-promoting, self-developing. The Gods enabled man to organize society and to live in partial peace and order. But the influence was indirect. The social instincts were aroused in his heart by the sense of common danger, coming from the same source, from the same Gods, whom they could not think of defying, but whom they tried to propitiate by joint prayer and worship, by joint sacrifices and by joint action in securing the objects to be sacrificed, chiefly beasts, which they afterwards slaughtered to please the Gods. This idea of joint action, of massive sacrifice, lies at the root of civilization as well as at the top of it.

Here a word about the origin of Gods may be useful. The idea of the existence of power apart from the power of man was always present in human consciousness. But the primal man had no idea that power could exist without life. Power and life-force were identified. Wherever there was manifestation of power, there was life beyond it. The idea of power superior to that of man came to his consciousness afterwards ; and when it came, it came as a tremendous, overpowering, irresistible force. This force was baptised as God. By and by several such forces invaded the consciousness of man, and increased the number of Gods. Gravitation, heat and electricity in their various forms of manifestations have originated the Gods. They have now been isolated from the latter, and are treated as physical powers, for good and evil, capable of being manipulated by man to a large extent. They have also been separated from life-force which is a distinct kind of force. Civilization has now advanced so far that a serious endeavour is being made to show that life-force is a derivative of the physical forces, obtained by permutation and combination. Whatever the ultimate result of research on this line may be it is all but certain that the origin of the animistic Gods lies in the error which failed to distinguish between life-force and physical force. The distinction between

primitive and civilized ideas lies in the fact that while the latter trace life-force to physical force the former traced physical force to life-force. The psycho-physical problem is unsolved down to this day.

The early Gods were spirits that forced themselves upon the attention of man by their violence displayed in hurtful activities. They were demons, not supermen yet, because not yet anthropomorphised. They flew in the air, but might have resided in the mountains or in the woods for a time. They gradually came to have a preference for certain kinds of trees, and the ground round them came to be selected for purposes of making sacrifices. They sometimes selected a whole mountain for their residence.

Many thousand years elapsed before man came to think of the existence of good also in the character of the Gods. The good seldom shows itself in a striking form. Even in these advanced times the good man takes a long time to be known to the public. Christ took a long time to be known to the world. Three hundred years elapsed before he was recognised as a great person. But the Prophet's name was known through half the world in the course of a couple of centuries. The area covered by Christ's name in one thousand years was hardly equal to what the Prophet's reputation covered in four centuries. Alexander and Napolean are known to more men than Shakespeare and Newton, than Paul and Peter. Darwin's name has spread more swiftly than that of Jesus Christ. Rain and storm are more striking than sunshine. The destructive flood is more striking than the water in irrigation channel. Hence it is no wonder the good Gods went unrecognised for long ages. The sun and the moon are places selected by two good Gods. They make the crops possible and provide food for men, and light in the dark.

Again a long time elapsed before the Gods of evil and the Gods of good were anthropomorphised, for man has good qualities of heart as well as evil ones, though the latter seem to preponderate. Spirits that are purely evil gradually come to lose respect and to disappear at last. Mixed spirits become common. Pure goodness in the Gods perhaps never received recognition, but man's attention became increasingly occupied with the good Gods, and with the goodness of God, with the progress of civilization.

Man has tried hard, but has never succeeded in creating either a God of pure good, or one of pure evil. Jehova, neither in his youth nor in his old age, was such a God ; nor was the wicked rival of his imperial majesty. The devil has points of goodness in him, which are being increasingly discovered by western civilization. And God had emotions which are now increasingly disapproved by human conscience, though the weight of goodness is submerged in the deep sea of evil in the one as the mass of evil is screened by the shroud of goodness in the other. God has also the reputation of disguising blessings in the form of curses. Some philosophers, unacquainted with hard manual labour, and rather bored by leisure have discovered that the curse of Adam was a blessing in disguise. Most men in the civilized world now believe that the serpent was a benefactor of humanity. At the present day unemployment makes the nations cry for work.

Even the God of philosophy with all his art and his power of persuasive reasoning and sophistication, has failed to escape the duality of good and evil. The utmost he can do is to reconcile the belligerents for the benefit of philosophers, who generally found their beliefs upon doubt, and sometimes upon an unconquerable will to believe, for whom truth and error imperceptibly merge into each other, who can at pleasure conjure up appearance as reality, and reality as appearance and who can make the ideal and the actual exchange places with each other.

The anthropomorphisation of the animistic Gods occupied a long time in history. It has not come to its completion yet. It will continue until the dwindling race of poets have counted their last compatriot. There still exist savages who worship them. Indra and Varuna have been completely anthropomorphised. But the sun and fire are in disputed position. Among the depressed castes in the Hindu world they are worshipped as animistic deities. The higher castes regard the sun God as a person. He was the father of Karna, the greatest hero of Kurukshetra, next perhaps to Arjuna and Bhishma. The sexual connexion was pre-marital for the mother, a mortal woman, who afterwards in married life, brought forth more heroes out of extra-matrimonial relations. Enigmatical as it may now appear animism now resides in the highest as well as in the lowest strata, though it has disappeared from the middle region. The God of philosophy is an animistic deity. Man himself

is now a subject of dispute, as to whether he is an animist or an epiphenomenalist, whether he is a spirit residing in matter, or a mere development of atoms, molecules and cells, chemically compounding or confounding themselves into a self-conscious subject lording it over the objective world.

If the ainmistic Gods forced themselves by their violence on the attention of man, and cannot therefore be regarded as created by him, the process of anthropopathism to which they were subjected and by which they were transformed into anthropomorphic or mythological Gods, clearly shows that their developmental progress owes much to the human intellect, and human imagination and human will to believe. But besides anthropomorphising the animistic Gods man created Gods of the new type on a scale so vast as to cast the former utterly into the shade. The God population of that part of the unseen world which overhang India exceeded at one time the Indian population as censused at the present day. The total God population, at its highest figure, was the aggregate of biogenetic issues and products of special creation, or the creative acts of human imagination. So far as their connection with this world was concerned and so far as they belong to the living objective world of which man is the subject or observer, the living God population of the present day may be counted on the finger's ends. These latter still receive worship and communion and love. The rest are either dead or as good as dead for the pragmatic intellect of man. I have observed that Christanity and Islam spread over half the world like a plague, and expelled the God population in mass from that half. The Gods were really colonists, and fled like the French from America and India before the onslaught of the English. The expulsion of the polytheistic Gods did not imply their annihilation but only a substitution of one group of Gods for another. The monotheistic Gods are not so singular nor the polytheistic ones so plural as is commonly supposed. The Gods of Christanity are the father, the son and the Holy Ghost, not to mention Satan and his legion, who have played a more important and extensive part in the affairs of this world than the triumvirate. In the pragmatic view of Gods the devil and his legion are more real than the triune. Man worships them not in the Church, but in their hearts. Man follows their instructions and wishes with great assiduity and enthusiasm, while they follow the decalogue only as a matter of form and custom. The curses held out by God are evaded by artifices,

invented and communicated by the devil. It might be affirmed, not without truth, that the father and son have been superseded by the devil and his legion. Mr. Shaw somewhere says that the Holy Ghost is at present the last survival of the trinity. He means that the other two have died of ennui and boredom, having no function to perform in the practical affairs of the world, while the Holy Ghost displays his activities under coercive persuasions of the devil.

My object here is to show that Christianity is polytheism under its skin. Its Gods are many, but primarily they form a duality of the Deity and the Devil. The Gods of Hinduism constitute at present a small pantheon. Siva, Vishnu and Bramha are the primary Gods. Sakti, Lakshmi and Saraswati are their wives. These in various forms constitute the pantheon. The rest have died of ennui, and bother the Hindus no more or very rarely. It is unfair to stigmatise Hinduism as polytheistic, while Christianity and Islam are regarded as monotheistic.

A monotheistic personal God is an absurdity, and he has never had a peaceful existence in human psychology. His existence implies that the infinite universe is ruled by a finite king. H. G. Wells has tried to create a new religion which he calls "modern religion," with a youthful finite God, whom he calls the invisible king, though the latter appears to have been completely, from head to foot, seen and scrutinised by him, like a candidate for a job at his disposal. I am afraid he has made a bad selection after all, for the job is tremendous, and a youthful and therefore inexperienced being, though intelligent, muscular and lovable and active may prove worse than no king at all. It is true the throne of heaven has for nearly a century been vacant for lack of a suitable candidate, but matters are not likely to improve under the rulership of the amiable young camouflaged, counterfeited gentleman with a luring look, whom Mr. Wells of Warwick wishes to place on it. We are told a large number of cultured people have communicated their approval of the selection, but there is reason to think the public will not deem it worth while either to pay homage to or to rebel against the new God, but they will simply ignore him. Mr. Wells objects to the father as God, for he is a bearded old man, senile and superannuated and therefore unable to manage the universe, which has inspite of him, of his love and hate, and his general meddlesomeness, developed biologically, politically, commercially, and

industrially into a stupendous empire of property, sex and race, which is now showing signs of breaking up, like the empire of Delhi in the 18th century. What western civilization wants is not a king, but a dictator like Mussolini, wrathful, ruthless and relentless, not an acquiescing, loving, courteous, king to keep order in a universe corrupted by socialism and democracy, which set up infinitesimal fractions of rulers as multitudinous as the population. The unseen world of the Hindus, with its three hundred and thirty million Gods was probably a republic with manhood suffrage. But that world is now all but desolate—a deserted village infinitely bigger than "sweet Auburn".

It is difficult to realise why Mr. Wells makes his God an invisible personality, unable to "promenade mount Horeb or Heaven", or why he allows him no 'throne'. He claims that his king shall have no body, parts or passions, except military love such as the Captain shows for the rank and file of the army. But in the ultimate analysis he is not only endowed with parts and passions, but such of them as do not cohere to one another.

Further criticism is superfluous. Such a God will never command a widespread will-to-believe, however strained it may be by intellectual torsion. It only helps to show that in a small corner of western civilization people are disgusted by the brutish luxuries of life and its dryness and frivolities and their own helplessness, and are thirsting to be relieved by a transcendental spirit.

I have dwelt at so much length upon the little book 'God the Invisible King', not out of hyper-critical frivolity, but under a sincere call of truth. The book represents a good illustration of the manner in which mythologisation and anthropomorphisation of animistic deities took place in the foretime. The success of every undertaking depends upon environment, upon circumstance, upon the surrounding psychology. I have predicted failure for that scheme because that psychology is unfavourable. But public opinion is a changeful thing like fashion, and it may be transformed into a favourable attitude in a few generations, and then Mr. Wells may be declared to be a prophet, but for the fact that there is a democratic, pervasive undertone of personal diffidence throughout the book. The poets and prophets in ancient time always spoke with aristocratic selfconfidence, inspired by a God-like master-mentality, and

appealed more emphatically to the senses than to the reflective understanding of their audience, even to the point of declaring or hinting that they had seen with their eyes what they had only faintly heard with their passion-plugged ears. Sensation, perception, cognition, emotion, imagination and volition were treated as undifferentiated phenomena of consciousness. They gained their knowledge of the phenomena of a God's life, as a whole at once, like the philosopher's cat on the wall, not in a summated form of the various contents of perception, *viz.*, the cat, the wall, the relative position of the two, the difference of colour existing between them, to say nothing of an analysis of the visible anatomy of the cat or the constructive genius of the architect who built the wall. Mr. Wells' efforts are vitiated by his analytical proclivity, his desire to be thorough and critical, with the result that destruction is more visible than construction in the entire performance. Iconoclasm is more prominent than God-making. The little book is an eloquent witness of the fact that the God of the Bible, of Christianity and Islam has now in old age become senile, dependent, moribund, bed-ridden and therefore tolerant, forgiving, merciful and generous by compulsion. He has lost all his pragmatic value, and lives by sufferance and custom, not by forcing conviction and coercing belief. Even the will-to-believe and the trust in him has lost half its heart. This is the highest achievement of western civilization, which was first coaxed, cajoled and corrupted, and then tortured, tormented and terrorized, but is now master of the situation, able to dictate to the father and the son, and to bamboozle the Holy Ghost.

The antagonism between the gods of mythology and of positive theology on the one hand and of the gods of philosophy on the other shows itself in growing divergence between the demands of the emotions and those of the intellect seeking satisfaction. Neither the emotions by themselves nor the intellect by itself can bring full satisfaction to the religious consciousness of man. The result of the conflict is a compromise between the two sets of gods, on the principle of give and take, producing a hybrid set of gods. In plain words mythology has a tendency to develop into philosophy, and philosophy occasionally has the opposite tendency to create mythology, under the pressure of the pragmatic views of life. In pagan Europe philosophy evolved out of mythology. In Christian Europe

philosophy sprang out of theology (the difference between which and mythology is negligible for my present purpose). The conflict is perennial and the compromise is a moving, fluid sort of reconciliation in which theology has been steadily though slowly superseded by philosophy. The truly theological aspect in Christianity is now all but completely eclipsed by philosophy and no intelligent Christian missionary in India now dwells with exultation upon the extraordinary revelations contained in the Book of Genesis or in the sensible revelation of the Gospels. Their god is now virtually an anthropomorphised pantheistic deity.

India has the unique distinction of having evolved mythology out of philosophy, of having evolved a pantheon of polytheistic gods out of the absolutistic abstractons of the Vedanta. In controversy with Christian missionaries the advocate of Hinduism appeals more to the Vedenta than to the Puranas, but in addressing the mob he dwells more profusely and forcefully upon the Puranas than on the Vedanta. Stories from the Srimatbhagawat are recited with corrupting embellishements for the benefit of all Hindu devotees, particularly of the devotees of the Vaishnav sect. The Vedanta is never attempted to be dealt with in this frivolous way. What is called Hinduism is a vague representation of the compromised form of religion now prevailing in India. Here purely intellectual satisfaction has yielded much to the demands of the emotions, and the mythology created ideals chiefly with gods of love and gods of strife, or gods in whom the spirit of love and strife are blended in various proportions.

The craving for emotional satisfaction created by intellectual dryness or boredom is a fact of stupendous weight when we come to judge of the tendencies of western civilization. Here intellectuality having played its part with great efficiency is now yielding place to the emotional needs of human nature on an unprecedented scale. Love and Hate are playing their parts in an intensive form ; the desire for amusement is displaying itself in new directions ; the craving for fame is showing fearless enthusiasm ; the will-to-live is growing paradoxically in proportion to increasing fearlessness. Love is extensively running across the boundaries of matrimony, and strife is assuming world-wide dimensions. Old ideals and purposes of life are changing, and the entire outlook on life is taking new shapes and colourings. The domestic form of life is giving way to purposefu

vagrancy. The gods are ignored, and the other world has lost its beauties and terrors, and men are thinking of a kingdom of plenty, freedom and leisure. Intellectuality is losing its expansiveness with the progress of industrialism, and specialization of occupation is limiting the versatility of mind, and its grasp or comprehension. A comparatively small number of men have opportunities for the enjoyments of life, while the rest are condemned to intellectually benumbing, and spiritually deadening labour. The war between the rich and the poor, between man and woman, between one race and another, between believers and infidels is showing new developments in undreamt of directions and magnitude. The world seems to be moving towards a new order or disorder, no body ventures to guess, which. There is visible on all sides a general madness, known to Hindu philosophy as *Moha*. Sports and games, theatres and operas, world tourings and air flights are undertaken by way of giving off pent up steam. Man seeks happiness, sits upon bags of money, furnishes his house gorgeously, lights it with electricity and equips it with electric fans, and playfully orders his chauffeur to be ready, and then drives away, and knows not, whither, exactly. His emotions crave for satisfaction, and he does not know where it can be obtained.

The predominance of the demands of the emotions was acknowledged, shortly before his death, by Herbert Spencer, who affirmed that the emotions were the masters, and the intellect their slave. Since then James has by his theory of will-to-believe further degraded the intellect and the convictions won by its instrumentality. The highest consciousnesses and convictions are now believed to come not through the reflective power of the mind, but by the creative energy of other mental forces, among which the feeling occupies the highest place. The psychological discovery of a subconscious region in the mind adds strength to the theory of instinctive belief and intuitions. This region in the mind which is supposed to be larger and potentially more fertile than the intellect is as yet undeveloped, uncultivated, unirrigated, uncared for. Full development of its resources will, it is supposed, solve all our troubles in relation to the unseen world, and save western civilization from rushing headlong into the abyss of ruination. The half-comprehended energy which constitutes the real driving force of this civilization will come into full view in the fulness of time to find salvation for mankind.

What is called the harmonious development of the self is the development of the intellect, the various emotions and the will, together with forces, as yet unknown or imperfectly apprehended, residing in the human constitution. In creating the gods of mythology hindu poets and philosophers gained an advantage for the multitudes of the race, but they not only failed to accomplish a harmonious development of the internal faculties of man, but by giving undue predominance to the emotions, introduced new elements of social disorder and weakness. The result is known to the student of history. The social mind is suffering from anarchy because the individual mind is in disorder. This last disorder is gaining ground in western civilization, and one hesitates to look upon its future with the degree of optimistic cheerfulness which characterises the least cultivated, because least harmoniously developed mind in the civilized world. The futile attempt at harmonious development of the irretrievably confused mind of man serves to create more disharmony until he begins to flounder in a sea of doubts and terrors. Civilization is a dangerous disease which first deprives man of commonsense and then strikes him senseless.

The subconscious region is an unknown tract in the depths of the bottomless mind, pregnant with volcanic possibilities, whence ooze out ideas and feelings, specially connected with the spiritual life of man. God has selected this region for his ordinary residence, whence he issues ordinances affecting practical life in extraordinary ways. It was an outburst from this region that turned the world from Kaffirism to belief in the Koran in a couple of centuries. A similar eruption had already turned the Roman empire from paganism to Christianity. The result of these eruptions was the substitution of one set of gods for another. Indeed all great events in the history of mankind are traceable to the fire emitted from this unseen region of the mind. The rapid conquest of philosophic India by the mythological Gods, was probably the result of such an eruption. The inconceivable progress of western civilization is also a phenomenon which the intellect fails to account for. Subconsciousness is like the famous accidental variation, which turns, albeit in the course of ages, one species into another. The region has not yet been completely explored, but its pragmatic effects upon practical life are visible throughout history. James speaks of this discovery

as a psychological triumph ; but empirical verifications have not come out of the clouds as yet. Until recently people knew subconsciousness by another name, *viz.*, mysticism deeply felt, but incapable of communication to neighbours, who remain unenlightened and sceptical. The 'unseen world' of philosophy is a province of the subconscious region. There is no place in the universe unaccessible to the devil of doubt, or too sacred for him. He is ever pursuing knowledge, and he is most conspicuous where the light of knowledge is the brightest. Newton's laws of motion have been overtaken at last by this devil. There is no absolute truth, but there are truths for individuals and communities. They are distinguished as pragmatic truths. The Gods of all countries were true in this sense, and have nearly ceased to be true now.

The mythological and theological Gods are kindred. They differ from the Gods of philosophy in that for good or evil they affect the practical life of man, while the latter are exclusively associated with the spiritual life, which is a new department of life unconnected or but remotely connected with the conquest of nature or behaviour towards neighbour. The boundary between the two departments has not yet been delimited or demarcated and each department sometimes encroaches upon the other. Broadly speaking the higher or the true self resides in the spiritual department. The lower self, the self of appearance, resides in the other department, which is often stigmatised as animal or brute life, as contrasted with the divine life of spirituality. As a rule the animal life can maintain itself without the help of the spiritual life, but the latter will languish unless regularly helped by the former. At the same time the two lives vary inversely in their activities and their growth. The paradox remains unsolved, and is the source of much disorder and confusion in human life. Western civilization is thriving because the spiritual life is languid. Eastern civilization is stagnant because the animal life is unduly neglected. A salutary synthesis of the two kinds of life has never been made, and civilizations have risen and fallen in the world, while men have looked on with a profound sense of imbecility.

The spiritual life has so far consisted of an unsuccessful effort to see the invisible, to hear the inaudible, to touch the intangible, to experience the inexperiencible, to know the unknowable, to comprehend the incomprehensible, to scrutinize the inscrutable,

to bend the inflexible, for human use and enjoyment. He has never known the boundary line between the visible and the invisible, the audible and the inaudible, the knowable and the unknowable, flexible and the inflexible, the absolute and the mutable ; but he has, sometimes felt or fancied that he has experienced the inexperiencible, that he has known the unknowable, that he has bent the inflexible, and placated the implacable by prayer and self mortification, by cultivating Vidya as contrasted with Avidya, self-renunciation as contrasted with life-affirmation, by contemplation as contrasted with activisation, by love, by madness, by losing self-consciousness, as well, of course, as the consciousness of the objective world, *i.e.*, by non-entitising himself.

The crucial point of difference between the east and the west lies in the fact that while the east is determined, inspite of past failures, to continue the pursuit of the invisible, and the incomprehensible, and the effort to bend the inflexible and to conquer the invincible, the west is seriously considering the wisdom of giving up this alchemic ambition. She is now more than half convinced that the unseen world is a mirage in the milky way, a nebulous idea, and the desire to grasp it is pragmatically worse than the child's desire to have the moon. She regrets the stupendous costly affair so far made in a doubtful adventure, in which thousands of geniuses, who might otherwise have lived splendid lives, made glorious conquests in the struggle for existence, demonstrated their heavenly fitness for survival, and satiated themselves with the sweetest fruits of such conquests, have lost their lives, floundering in the sloughy swamp of self sacrifices, privations, life-negations and doubts. She proudly points to her conquests in the visible world, her conquests in the air, under the water and on the battle field, her conquests on the surface of the earth and within its bowels, illuminating, cooling and heating, embellishing and embroidering the landscape, and turning it into a world where life is demonstrably worth living, and seriously, with a tone of visible and audible contemptuousness, calling on her eastern sister to follow in her footsteps, and enjoy the fruits gathered by her, if she is unable to gather any for herself. Her offer is unconditional except for one thing, *viz.*, that she must cease to talk of the mad effort to reach the invisible world and of its possibilities. The latter is hesitating. Some of her children are in favour of unconditional acceptance ; most of them refuse like the hungry wolf to follow the fatty mastiff ; while others want to have

possession of the visible world without discontinuing the pursuit of the invisible. Hèr western sister smiles and says ; "You can have either ; but not both ; I have tried the invisible and abandoned the adventure ; out of charity I am offering you participation in the fruits gathered by me ; if you do not follow me voluntarily, I shall compel you, because it is a condition of the continuation of my success."

Dietetically speaking, pure vegeterians are now rare in the west, and will be rarer still in the future. The dominant tone of western civilization favours a purely meat diet as more wholesome and invigorating. Butcher's meat is now becoming popular in the east, and pure vegeterians are decreasing in number, and a mixed diet is now common. Social reformers who prescribe pure vegeterianism are loudest in vocality. Mixed diet-philosophers are less vociferous but not reticent. Pure-meat-philosophers are silent but active. The real question is, mixed diet being inevitable, what should be the proportion between meat and vegetables in the diet of the coming generations, and what kind of meat should be selected, whether beef, camel or mutton, or all of them. Industrialism, nationalism, imperialism, feminism, individualism, socialism, Darwinism and federationism all belong to the dietetics of the west. Together they form a most complex, and mutually helping or mutually antagonising menu ; and western civilization herself is suffering from dyspepsia, which shows a tendency to grow, while doctors are at variance in their opinion as to the remedy to be prescribed. Meanwhile the constitution is getting emaciated and debilitated to the point of causing alarm. The truth is that things are not what they ought to be either in the east or in the west, and a new synthesis is necessary for both. Meanwhile all that is harmful in western civilization, either singly or in mixture, is peacefully penetrating into the east, without the redeeming features which exist in the west. The world is nearing a critical stage in its career. Neither the theory of progressive evolution nor that of cyclicism can either explain or find a remedy for the present situation. Meanwhile pain and suffering, raptures and exultations, are producing a deafening noise throughout the entire atmosphere, eastern and western included. The one-empire theory has been nipped in the bud by the great war. The international league is a feeble substitute, and is growing feebler with time. A strong snow-fall can benumb it. The west is threatened by the further west, and Europe

is no longer a term of glory, and western civilization is getting badly scattered and confused. The time is fast approaching when a new name will have to be substituted to satisfy the demands of geodesy.

THE GODS IN RETREAT.

The most remarkable phenomenon in the progress of western civilization is the growing decay of belief in the existence of gods and in their desire, if not in their power, to interfere in the affairs of human life. This decay follows, as the night follows the day, or what is more appropriate, in the new atmosphere, in the new frame of mind, as the day follows the night, from the growth of belief in the law of natural causation as contrasted with the belief in supernatural causation. If human nature has any meaning it is more natural for man to believe in supernatural causation than in natural causation. The latter belief is a slowly growing sophistication or spiritual corruption of the former. I call it a corruption, because it is remoter from god, the supreme supernature, taken with the fact that nature is inferior to supernature, in sanctity, purity and power. Natural causation was not unknown to primitive man, but it held a lower position, as a derivative law, in his estimation. Natural causation did not satisfy human nature, and and when any phenomenon was explained by this law, man asked, what is it that lies behind it? Who created it, who superintends it from behind the screen? Who watches to see that it is not going astray, that it is not trying to extend its scope and function, its authority and coercive power? How can such an airy nothing be trusted to work by its own power, at its own discretion or for purposes of its own, apart from the purpose of its creator?

It will appear from the last sentence that the original law of natural causation had a spiritual element in it, a tendency towards self-anthropomorphisation, which is now wholly drowned in the sea of oblivion, beyond the remotest possibility of salvaging. This spirit lived in full manhood down to Kepler's time. It was a spirit of colossal strength that wheeled the universe round the earth in regular order. Natural law consisted in the regularity of motion,

but the force required to cause the world incessantly to whirl was supplied by the vital power of the spirit. The natural law was the costume in which the latter thought fit to appear before human consciousness. Newton turned the spirit into what he called ether, which is neither pure matter nor pure spirit, but something which partakes of the traits of both. It is imponderable matter, or ponderable spirit. It is spiritual matter or material spirit. It is not void space or solid matter. It is the connecting link between spirit and matter, between subject and object. It is the quality pervading the infinite space that enables the subject to make the acquaintance of the object, and to permit them to live on indissolubly intimate terms. All conscious life is a manifestation of relativity, that is, of a mysterious inseparableness between mind and matter, though they live in perennial opposition.

The unkindest cut inflicted by Newton with his theory of light on spirit—not on this spirit or that, but on spirit as a whole, the inner reality of the change, was the degradation of the spirit from the position of the master to that of slave. The more humane and intelligent view is that it was a case of mere subordination, not of enslavement, and that the transformation was effected by a legerdemain, by a sort of scientific miracle. Galileo had offended the orthodox, catholic universal spirit by his theories which collided with the Christian cosmogony, but Newton's tact and artfulness saved the situation for science, and since then science has been advancing rapidly.

The transformation of the universal spirit needs further explanation. Originally it was the spirit or a part of it that whirled the worlds, it is now gravitation conceived as a quality of matter, that causes the whirling through the spirit of space. Every movement, however insignificant, now makes an incision through the pectoral parts of the universal spirit. Light, heat, electricity, magnetism and gravitation all cut across it, in a monstrously cruel meandering course, which is called in science 'vibration' or 'undulation'. The solid earth receives a shaking at long irregular intervals, but the glorious spirit of the foretime is perpetually shaken in all directions by material forces, which formerly obeyed his will, reasoned or arbitrary. No doubt the spirit remains universal and infinite, eternal and continuous as before, but how fallen ! from what heights of activity and ascendancy and glory, hurled into the infinite

abyss of passivity, obedience, resignation and insignificance. The great spirit has now been metamorphosed into King Log, trampled on and insulted, slighted and ignored by scientific frogs.

But redeeming features are not altogether absent in the atmosphere of western civilization. If science has shown a steady tendency to materialize spirit, Philosophy is characterised by the opposite tendency of spiritualising matter, of attenuating it into thought, ideas and impressions, and raising them from the human to the divine level. The old animistic spirits have been refined from plurality into unity, from mere material forces into conscious, self-conscious thought, infinite, eternal, absolute first cause, sole regulator, universal peace maker, in whom the opposition of subject and object finds its presupposition, ultimate reconciliation and everlasting harmony. The scientific and the philosophic transformation invisibly pass through a process of etherialization, carried on in the mysterious, subconscious or subliminal region of the mind.

At the same time it would be unfair to ignore recent endeavours in the scientific world to etherialize matter. The electron and proton theory testifies to the impatience which human nature feels with the grossness of matter. The superiority of spirit is thus subconsciously recognized. The psycho-physical problem is, no doubt, still unsolved. Mind and body are either two parallel types of substance, working in unison, or one of them is derived from the other. Indian philosophy predominantly regards matter to be a product of mind. Ancient Greek philosophy had the same tendency. Modern German philosophy also supports it. But the most recent tendency in western civilization while pointing in the opposite direction, stops short, and finds for the present a resting place on the road side, where the essence of things is neither ponderable matter, nor imponderable spirit. The electron and proton theory is yet in inchoate state and it would be rash to prophesy where the progress of the theory will ultimately end. The psycho-physical problem has been elaborately dealt with by Professor McDougal in "Body and Mind" But he has made no reference to the electron and proton theory which he either considers as irrelevant or too imperfect to merit discussion in connection with the problem. He acknowledges himself as an animist, though in a very diffident tone, but spurns the idea of being regarded as an animist of the primitive type. Herbert Spencer while convinced

that the first principles relating either to matter or spirit, including force and motion are unknowable, has written ten large volumes on the activities of matter and spirit, to convince his fellow men of the truth of secondary principles, without worrying about the primary principles. The atmosphere of western civilization is surcharged with doubts and uncertainties, activities without an ultimate purpose, boundless fatuities, bewildering to the eastern mind. Old ideas regarding the unseen world, and old ideals to be actualised in that world after death in this, are not dead, but new ideas are emerging with new ideals to be actualised by remote generations in the future within this world itself, with the result that life is becoming purposeless, unmeaning, fatuous, and delusive, and not worth-living. Life is becoming a monstrous struggle for existence, for power and ascendancy, for accumulating wealth, for consuming the entrails of the world as quickly as possible, while professing the ideal of plenty and prosperity, peace and happiness to be realised by the pre-impoverished generations of the future.

The chasm between the two civilizations increased in width for centuries, and now defeated, Christian or anthropomorphised animistic civilization, is carrying on a defensive apologetic existence. It may truly be affirmed that present day Christanity is a mere apology for what it was five hundred years ago, when out of sheer faith it profusely used fire and fagot for the spiritual benefit of men of modern science as distinguished from Mosaic science, embodied in the Book of Genesis and minutes of œcumenical councils. Faith has lost its savagery, bigotry and coercive power. The will-to-believe is moving in new directions, undulating through the ether of experience, observation and verification.

Hindu philosophy with all its spirituality and absolutism, found the finite spirit to consist of fine and thin, invisible matter, in the shape of *Suksmasarir* or *lingasarir*. But it was silent with regard to the infiite spirit. In the human personality the spirit is a more lasting reality than the body. In Europe in primitive times the human body was considered to constitute the real personality, possessed with a spirit which was an outside substance. This is evident from the phrase "giving up the ghost". In some civilizations the spirit is not severed from the body at death, but continues to reside in it in a semiconscious state until judgment is pronounced from the unseen world as to its future residence.

Generally, philosophers avoid the question as to the substance of the spirit, and hold long discussions as to continuity of consciousness after death, and as to the immortality of the soul. The soul of Christ lived for four days in the grave, embodied in the corpse, and then ascended with pageantry through the clouds.

The souls of the Christians and Mussalmans pass through the ordeal of a judicial trial, and remain as undertrial prisoners in the buried corpse until the day of trial, of which no notice seems to be given to them in time to enable them to prepare their defence. The day is called the day of judgment, which is probably not a judgment at all in the civilized sense, but a mere order which might profitably be concomitant with the cessation of breathing or of consciousness, which we call death. There is no explanation for this delay, and it is probable the judge finds the work too heavy for him. It is also said that cases are gathered for the assizes for the sake of expedition.

The judgment is called the last judgment, and sometimes also assize. Christ acts like Portia in the trial of the Merchant of Venice, and makes suggestions to the court as to whether the accused deserves mercy after conviction. This suggestion is based on the degree of loyalty shown by the prisoner at the bar and on past services rendered by him, *i.e.*, on faith and works. Loyalty is measured by the dolly of faith and flattery, the substitutes for flowers and fruits, which are legitimately offered to public servants in high places. Without irreverence to truth it may be said that the services are alms and aids, food and harbour, given to accursed vagrants and fugitives, now fellow-prisoners at the bar. It is sometimes said that entire humanity, when some cosmic accident has smashed the world will be tried together, the prisoners pining in their graves in the meanwhile (really a very long while) living in the quiescent peace of death. Grey's elegy shows that Hampden and Milton had been thus waiting for the assize for a couple of centuries at the date of writing.

Judgment and trial are held in Hindu mythology by the judge, who is ordinarily known as the God of death (Yama). But he really acts like a magistrate, and not a judge. He only determines by his judgment where the undertrial period will be passed, whether in hell or heaven, after which rebirth will come by automatic judgment, and a new life on earth will begin, though it is believed to be

a mere continuation of the old life. It is said a great lady now living represents Spinoza in rebirth. It is not known where he lived during the undertrial period or how he came to change sex. Perhaps the change of sex is part of the law of Karma.

The human spirit has been much handled by philosophers mythologists, theologists and commonplace men. But they all appear to be shirkers, and ashamed to acknowledge that they are. Positivists and agnostics pretend to be unconcerned about it. But they too cannot fully ignore it. Spencer particularly can not claim the honour of ignoring the spirit. Huxley neither believed nor disbelieved in spirit. Evasion is the general order. Spirit has a tendency to disappear, and matter has a tendency to attenuation. When both disappear true freedom of thought and expression will come.

Nothing is more perplexing in life than the conflict between the desire to see the unseen and the incapacity to see it. The worst of it is that the desire is stronger than the incapacity, and is also immortal. The light that beats upon every thing else in this world proves inadequate when man tries to turn the search light upon the problem of spirit and its activities. Invasions into the unseen world have never ceased, but its intellectual conquests are insignificant. Mahmud of Ghazni invaded India seventeen times and conquered very little. He broke the heads of idols, and thought he had broken their spirits. The spirit of idolatry remained firm after all his achievements in iconoclasm. He probably thought that he had accomplished the destructive process necessary for the subsequent creation of the spirit of Islam in India. He was sadly mistaken. No doubt the Muhammadan community now muster strong in the Indian population, but this result is due more to the biogenetic propagation than to religious proselytization and conversion.

The unseen world was gradually severing its connection with the visible world when the doctrine of spiritism supported by planchet observations and actual perception by men of culture revived the connection, and reduced the spirit world into slavery. The spirits of the dead were subjected to the beck and call of man and of trivial machinery. Huxley humourously said that while he had nothing to urge against the truths discovered by the spiritists, he would be the first person to raise the standard of rebellion against

this slavery, if he were sent to this unseen world, where peace, privacy and freedom were unknown. The term spiritism is comparatively recent. It originally started with the majestic name of spiritualism as if it were associated with the universal absolute spirit, the supreme personality which ruled the destinies of human life and of the universe more effectively, more rationally, more generously and graciously than natural laws, which though created by Him had become perverse, cruel and unsatisfying for human requirements.

The change of name from spiritualism to spiritism was not conceived by spiritists but by true spiritualists on the one hand and by anti-spiritualists on the other, *i.e.*, by civilized animists and by cultured epiphenomenalists. Spiritism is not much heard of now. Theosophists played some spiritistic miracles and thereby gathered some half-educated disciples but they afterwards discovered that these miracles were degrading to their main scheme, which was to diffuse a knowledge of God and of the unseen world. Spiritism made the spirits visible either at their own will or in response to the requests of man. In other words spiritism pretended to bring the invisible into visible contact with man. Its object was to raise man to a higher level of consciousness, but its real effect was to debase the spirits to a lower level, and to make them contemptible. The association of God with spiritualistic spirits, dragged him out of the region of incomprehensibility which was part of the original scheme of the creation of life and consciousness. Any thing which depresses God, instead of elevating man is in the long run destructive of the religious feeling. Anything which makes God visible to, and brings him into contact with, all men, plebeian and patrician, decreases reverence for him. The Viceroy at Simla is a more august personage than the Viceroy at Calcutta. In all religions God speaks to man through a go-between. The Christ and the Prophet were such intermediaries. Krishna in the Gita was another, though he pretended to be God in person, the infinite, eternal absolute God. The *aptas* were distinguished from the Christian and Islamic go-betweens, by their plurality, compensated for by their high culture.

From all that has been indicated above, it will appear that faith in God depends upon environment in which the faithful lives, and the general culture which he has attained. In one state of culture a visible God exacts more faith than an invisible God. In a higher

state of culture, God has need to be invisible. There is a condition of culture in which a go-between is of great help to the faithful; in a higher culture the intermediary is a clog. Priests are agents of a go-between, with credentials of different values. Unpaid agents have a higher value than paid ones. The payment may be direct or indirect. In some religions, the agent, while pretending to act without payment, helps himself out of the offerings made to God. In such cases the value of the offerings and sacrifices are fixed with reference to the economic condition of the faithful, and it is the interest of the priest not only to desire a higher condition among his clientele, but also to strain facts to give it a higher value in representation. Undue exactions on the part of the priesthood is detrimental to faith. In every form of religion the more marvellous thing is not that faith is so weak and low, but that it is so strong and high, not that it is so precarious, but that it is so stable. Religion has more destructive forces to contend with than creative ones to help it forward. Religion labours under the alternative between progress and decay, and requires incessant attention and circumspection. The general decay of religion at the present time is largely due to lack of attention. The subordination of religion to politics means the subordination of the interests of the unseen world to those of the visible, and is therefore destructive of faith. Bigotry is pernicious to religion. It turns attention outward, while pretending to strengthen faith inward. Bigotry shows itself in hostility to neighbour, and this is destructive of love for mankind. It fosters discriminative love for a small section of humanity, while love of God means love for all his creatures, as well as for his own personality. Heresy is bad when unopposed. New ideas of all kinds give a shaking to religion, and the diffusion of secular culture is the greatest enemy of God, *i.e.*, of faith in God. If it does not positively oppose faith it draws away attention from God by providing adequate occupation for the mind in this world. Nationalism draws away attention from humanism; communalism draws away attention from nationalism; individualism draws away attention from communalism; the animal self draws away attention from the interests of the spiritual self. It will thus be seen that religion has more enemies than friends, and it is marvellous that it still exists after so much has been done to improve civilization. Civilization in the early stages helps religion; in its later developments it weakens it first, by depriving it of reason, like the Roman Gods, and then kills it.

On the other hand communalism largely draws away attention from the individual self, Nationalism draws away attention from communalism. Here ends the progress of collectivism in western civilization. Humanism receives only a camouflaged reverence, for it draws away attention from nationalism, and western culture is at heart unwilling to allow attention to be withdrawn from it. Weak humanism means weaker reverence for universalism or for life as an organic whole, and lack of this reverence reduces reverence for God and weakens consciousness of His existence if it does not put him out of existence altogether. Thus nationalism is one of the main causes of the general atrophy in matters spiritual.

On the other hand nationalism is fostered by the Darwinian conception of life. It substitutes the nation for the Darwinian species, and the struggle for national progress, for the struggle for preservation of species, with the associated idea for survival of one's own nation at the expense of surrounding nations. No stone is left unturned for the purpose of acquiring the highest level of fitness for survival. The struggle for existence is identified with international competition in general, and with international war (in actu or in posse) in particular. Thus Darwin's struggle for existence is interpreted in the life of western civilization as struggle for ascendancy or leadership in the world and in extreme cases as the struggle for extinguishing other nations. With regard to inferior races its opinion is decided. Their inferiority shows that they have lost all chance of ascendancy and now the best purpose for which they can be permitted to continue their existence is to live as slaves or exploitable objects for one or another of the competing nations. If they refuse to resign themselves to this position, the highest moral sentiments suggest their early extinction, and means for it are adopted, and the final end is achieved by hook or by crook.

Thus wherever Darwin advances, Christ retreats, and with the son the father retreats also, leaving the holy ghost to deal with the insurgence of disruptive ideas. Mr. Shaw probably means that the problem of population is the final arbiter in human affairs under western civilization when he says that of the trinity the Holy Ghost is the most conspicuous figure in the pragmatic faith of humanity at the present day. Even there western civilization has not fully made up its mind as to whether a holiday taken by the Holy Ghost or redoubled activity on his part will benefit the civilized world.

I have indicated before that there are more enemies of God than friends among men. Positivists, agnostics, atheists, rationalists, nationalists, naturalists, evolutionists, anthroposophists, humanists and pragmatists all belong to the former class, covertly or overtly. But God, it would seem to the scrutinising mind, suffers more, in the advanced culture and the altered atmosphere of western civilization, by the insensate devotion of the faithful than by the recalcitrancy and positive assaults of infidels. He is, it may be sincerely believed more annoyed and worried by prayer, praise and flattery of the devout than by the aloofness of those who ignore him as one not wanted in the pragmatic sense. In the "Innocents Abroad" I find that God was given unstinted praise by a solemn gathering of devout Christians, in a vessel plying from New York to Plymouth for giving them the advantage of a stiff western breeze. Mark Twain drew their attention to the absurdity of thanking the God of Humanity, when they had passed many vessels on their way, straggling and struggling towards the west under unseasonable conditions.

In the Great war both the belligerents asked for divine help, not for bringing peace by ending the war, but for victory which meant defeat and destruction of the enemy, *i.e.*, for mutual annihilation, a nice way of approaching the God of universal love, who inscribed the Decalogue in his own hand, and afterwards sent his son to explain the tenth commandment more fully, illustrated by his own example. God was solemnly thanked after each victory by the victorious party. Praise has contumely for its correlate, and thanks have curses. It is difficult to estimate whether God has so far received more praises and thanks than contumelies and curses, and it is reasonable to suspect that praise in one place invites contumely in another, and thanks invite curses. Seeing that there is, inspite of progressive civilization, more suffering than happiness in this world it is reasonable to consider that the growth of infidelism is excusable. Of course, God does not expect thanks from neo-Darwinians who believe that the harder the struggle for existence the greater the chance of progress ; but the truth is if the latter were in the habit of cultivating communion with God, they would have thanked him more wholeheartedly than devout Christians ever did.

The habit of thanking God for successes, while ascribing failures to human frailties is invested with a detrimental irrationality,

which has given rise to rationalism, the worst and the most desperate enemy of God, which runs through all the forms of infidelism mentioned above.

The logical faculty, the desire to be coherent, the aversion to believe in contradictory propositions, and in their corollaries, in practical life are the highest gifts for which man feels constrained to be thankful to his creator. Anything which runs counter to these elements in his nature irritates man, and excites militancy in his heart, which makes him either keep aloof or engage in spiritual war, which culminates in infidelism. Infidelism may be divided into heresy, aggressive disbelief and non-co-operative unbelief. Heretics do not deny the existence of God, but they deny the character attributed to Him in the official creed or form of faith. Aggressive disbelief, or denial of God's existence is rare, and Dr. Besant explains that atheism means (without God, not opposition to or denial of Him) It may be remarked that the available evidence on the question is nearly balanced. Non-co-operative unbelief or spiritual neutrality is the general frame of mind in which culture finds peace and rest from spiritual turmoil. This neutrality may arise in two distinct ways, *viz.*, either from the inability to find a conclusive intellectual verdict, or from the experience that for actual life, *i.e.*, for self-preservation it is not necessary to believe in the existence of God or to pray to Him. God has no practical value for civilized man, and is therefore not true for him ; and consequently the will-to-believe in Him remains asleep or provisionally dead. If in the future God acquires such value, the pragmatist will be inclined to believe in His existence and to worship Him. James has assumed complete responsibility on this point, and generously undertaken to compel future generations of pragmatists to fulfil this promise. The spiritual atmosphere of the world at the present day is surcharged with the laughing gas of pragmatism.

The idea that the king can do no wrong, however it may have arisen, is destructive of loyalty, while it pretends to strengthen the position of the king. If the king can do no wrong, it logically follows that he can do no right ; and if he can do neither he has ceased to be a king in reality, though in appearance he may look, and preside over pageants, like one. He is a non-entity, and his kingdom is a limited monarchy, *i.e.*, a monarchy limited to cipherdom ; which is tantamount to saying that the country is democratic

or ruled by the people themselves or suffers from anarchy. This is humanism applied to political life. The idea that God can do no wrong has brought into existence Humanism in the complete life of man. Pragmatism and Humanism are all but synonymous, and pragmatists and Humanists are all Godless creatures. They have done more to put the Gods to flight than any other power in the universe.

The prayer which implies the suspicion that God, left to himself, is in the habit of leading men into temptation is most uncomplimentary to the divine conscience and self respect. Yet it is repeated from day to day, not by atheists and agnostics, but by God's own favourities. The other prayer which asks God to find provision for the daily consumption of the faithful, while the ordinance regarding sweat in the face remains in force is a piece of irritating irreverence. It seems to have had its origin in the hunting stage of life, though wheaten bread is expressly mentioned. But wheat does not grow every day. It is grown once a year and then stored for twelve months' consumption, and when God is asked daily to give it to a prayerful soul, he is virtually asked to comit theft from another man's store. The prayer is induced by a bitter sense of the curse. Rationalism on the other hand far from feeling the sting of the curse, in the opinion of Professor Wundt and other learned respectable men, considers it not a curse at all but a blessing in disguise. Can it be denied that these accursed people help the divine cause more efficaciously than the so-called saints and devotees ?

To ascribe discriminative love to the father of the universe is to degrade him in thought to a level lower than what the father of a family commonly occupies. Even Christ sometimes ran into irreverence. When the sufferings on the cross became unbearable he suspected that his father had forsaken him, and he loudly gave vent to his suspicion in the presence of pagans and infidels. When he asked God to forgive the persecutors and the executioners on the same occasion, he virtually pretended that the crucifixion was not a prearranged plan, and adopted the art which Peggotty in David Copperfield used, two thousand years later, to add bitterness to her condemnation of acts which she disapproved. It was, as the reader probably remembers, her habit to exclaim, "May the Lord forgive you for having said this or done that," whenever a controversy arose between her and a neighbour, whom she feared to offend.

It almost seems, to be regarded as superhuman, one has need to be subhuman at times.

If God has desires like men, the desire of having loyal servants by his side must be one of them. He is surrounded by servants called angels. He either requires more servants, or He does not. He is a kind master and pays for the services of his servants, lavishly or moderately. If he does not require more servants, it is useless to seek service in his household. If on the contrary he requires them, and wants to make Humanity the recruiting ground, the greatest mistake that he could make was to create hunger and lust. The ancient Gods themselves were subject to these passions, but they were not supreme beings, the First Cause, the Absolute Master of the universe. The Christian God has the pretension of not having them, and to Him I refer particularly, because he is the God of western civilization, supposing that western civilization has really one at heart.

Experience shows unmistakably that Hunger and the sex appetite most forcibly draw the attention of men and women from the unseen world and its Ruler to the visible world and its tyrants. The problem of Hunger and Sex appetite is becoming increasingly difficult of solution in western civilization. More than half of adolescent humanity in the western countries have no opportunity for the legitimate satisfaction of sex appetite. About the same number of men and women gratify hunger on coarse wittle with great difficulty, and at great cost of time which leaves no leisure for cultivating communion with God or for receiving a training for his service. So long as more than half the world was uncivilized, civilized men could satisfy hunger by exploiting the labour of uncivilized men. They could also find shelter by exterminating the latter, and occupying their dwelling places. These processes are known in civilized vocabulary as slavery and colonization respectively. At present the colonized area of the world is larger than the home land of western civilization, which enslaved Africa and colonized America for example. The very progress of civilization by these processes, has rendered it necessary to turn exploitation inward and civilized men are now sharply divided, for my purpose, into exploiters and exploitables. The exploitables are in a sad plight. All their time and attention are given to earning bread at the cost of such enormous perspiration as God never meant for Adam and

his children. Self-preservation cost all their time, and some times cost them their lives, and the lives of their wives and children, so that they have no leisure for cultivating communion with God. They are becoming infidels. The struggle for existence is hardening every year with increasing population, and God is retreating from the heart of man in due proportion.

Unsatisfied hunger is undoubtedly an evil. Experience shows (and pragmatists are empiricists) that to fight against evil it is more useful to appeal to the devil than to God for help. This discovery was not made by western civilization, but its truth has been convincingly demonstrated by precise verification on an unprecedented scale by the latter.

God laid external nature at the disposal of man for the satisfaction of hunger. External nature has been largely exploited. But it has been found that the exploitation of nature to be useful, requires the exploitation of neighbour even more largely. This was evidently not foreseen by God, and no provision was made for its avoidance. There are civilized men who fondly hope that machinery would completely supplant help by neighbour or exploitation of them. Divine foresight is found lacking at every stage in the progress of western civilization, and the appeal to the devil in preference to God is visible on all sides. It is a paradox of western civilization that while appeals to the devil by the individual for small benefits are condemned in thought, and severely punished in practice, united appeals for large benefits are eulozised as meritorious and morally glorious, because they are supposed to be conducive to the progress of civilization. God accustomed to be annoyed and irritated by small defections, is horrified by the magnitude of atrocious outrages, and retreats from the field out of a sheer sense of helplessness and disgust.

The old moralities prescribed by the Decalogue and emphasised by annotations in the sermon on the mount are now drowned in the sea of group-life, where they are flung by the necessity of self-preservation. When God said "Thou shalt not commit murder ; thou shalt not steal" He evidently meant that no individual person should commit these crimes. Western civilization with the instinct of the lawyer has discovered that God had no idea of corporate life or collective personality ; and that the Decalogue does not apply to the personality of the nation or of any well defined or well

organized section of a community, whose interests are injuriously affected by the power of other nations or other organized sections. Under the new law murder continues to be a crime, but massacre is glorious. Theft continues to be a crime, but gang robbery is meritorious. Drake and Hawkins, Clive and Hastings are splendid personalities in the eye of western civilization, but God detests them, and man forsakes God, because the latter is not up-to-date in casuistry. The corporate soul has no terror of eternal perdition, because it is not a sum total of the souls of its members, but an organic whole, with greater power for good and evil, and for defying, thwarting, frustrating, circumventing divine purpose.

What is known as the fall of man is the suffering caused by unsatisfied hunger and over-satiated sex-appetite. By the expulsion from Paradise man and woman lost the advantage of the fruit garden. They were compelled to eat wheaten bread, though there was plenty of living beef and mutton grazing in the fields. The militancy of Cain, who had become a good cultivator, caused the wheat fields to be incrusted with hard stone. To crown all Eve was cursed with excessive love for her husband, and with Canadian fecundity (See Spencer's Principles of Biology). This was designed to make the fall effective, for the omniscient father of mankind knew, long before Adam Smith and John Mill, the law of diminishing return. The curses are mutually complementary. At present the total quantity of hunger in the world is incalculable. Collective life has divided mankind into a duality. Satiation and starvation stand face to face, and make angry grimaces at each other. The rich seem still to live in Paradise, whereas among the poor the men sweat in the wheat fields, factories and workshps, while child-bearing makes the lives of women unbearable burdens. Socialism and feminism have created forces calculated to bring the rich and poor together on a middle plane between heaven and hell. In the meanwhile God is ashamed of the substantial failure of his curses, and is hiding himself from church and chapel, which have ceased to be attended by at least 75% of men and women whose parents and grandparents were accustomed to visit them once a week at least. One feels for the waste of money spent on these divine dwelling places. Probably they will be converted into amusement clubs, which will be more useful to the sweated souls of the people. The retreat of the God, has been outrageously accelerated during the past hundred years or so with the exception of the Holy Ghost, whose

temple is in the body of man, and who is said to be the sole survivor of the trinity now (Mr. Shaw's Man and Superman).

The rich do not attend church because they have nothing to pray for. Their bread is baking in the oven, and hot water for the morning tea is simmering on the stove. The poor do not attend it because they find God helplessly circumvented by the rich, who have thrown on them all the productive and reproductive labour, all the sweat on their men, and all the conception on their women, and who add cakes to their bread, and isolate conjugal love from conception. Capitalism and contraceptives have conquered the curses for the rich, and proved that God is too senile to enforce his ordinances uniformly and without communal discrimination, and to rule civilized men and women efficiently. God is for the savage and for the ignorant. It is more useful to ask for leisure and free education than to pray to God for bread and unembarrassing, uncomplicated sexual satisfaction. The mission from heaven in the early years of the Christian era for the restoration of paradise to men and women who trace their descent in a direct line from Adam and Eve, having egregiously failed for the majority of men and women, has been demonstrated to be an imposture by Nietzschean philosophy and this has all along been subconsciously felt in a silent or subdued spirit of irreverence by the civilized masses, who are now engaged in fighting capitalism and imperialism by the power of collectivism, instead of by the power of prayer and of God, who has given them stones in response to their daily entreaties for bread, repeated for five thousand years. God is neither loved nor hated, neither revered nor dreaded, but simply and silently ignored. People do not beseech Him for bread or to save them from sexual temptation, but leave Him alone to consume Himself in His cold furnace of indignation and imbecility. The Great Wrath has lost its terrors. The world still exists in spite of the confident anticipations of the Baptist, beheaded for his pessimistic, even alarmistic, prognostications.

The rule of life for long ages has been that the rich and the powerful should enjoy life in this, and the poor and helpless anticipate it in the next world. Christ evidently had this general idea in mind when he compared the chances of the rich to find access to heaven to those of the camel to pass through the eye of the needle, for they carry too much luggage for the narrow gate. Liberally

interpreted, the rule is that the one bird in the hand is for the rich man, while two in the bush are for the poor. The idea of immortality or continuity of consciousness after death is suggested by the lofty morality of retributive justice, which satisfies both hope and malice, though Lord Balfour (Foundation of Belief) seems unconsciously to eliminate the latter and to reduce its value to half its legitimate dimensions. The satisfaction of hope or mania in this problematic way is now disregarded by western civilization, whose personal dignity and robustness of character are offended by the idea of dependence and helpless submission. It is prepared to ask for help on terms of parity, like the belligerents in the great war who asked America to join it on their side. The poor now stand on their own right, and depend on their own power, strengthened by collective organization. The organic whole is greater than the aggregate in power and dignity, while it transcends the ordinary rules of morality. Collective organization has developed western civilization in undreamt of ways ; it may one day destroy it. But fearlessness is a characteristic virtue of this civilization. Socialism and feminism are as characteristic of western civilization as capitalism and masculinism. They are mutually hostile and destructive. Logically they cannot live together, but actually they are living in juxtaposition. The end is uncertain. But the life of western civilization is a life of war. It prefers death to peace, like the Rajput queens celebrated in Todd's Rajasthan.

If instead of making it the virtual monopoly of the poor, crowding from the slums of east end, east end of London, east end of Europe, east end of the globe, and the failures of life, it had been made fully accessible to aristocrats, plutocrats, autocrats, explorers, exploiters, conquerors, brigands and successful men in general, heaven would certainly have been a more respectable and attractive place to dwell in, and the earth would have had a chance of being more rapidly purged of weakness, of muscular, moral, nervous and intellectual weakness, and of approaching the ideal of worldly life according to biological evolutionism, the guiding principle of western civilization, its ideal, its justification, its true significance. This plan would have extinguished the eternal opposition between the visible and the invisible world, and brought them into line. It would have made eternal perdition, the central jail of the universe, a superfluity in creation. Indeed of the fact that it was created before there was light there is no evidence, historical or cosmological. That it was created

after that radiantly melancholy event, shows that it was built on a lop-sided plan, diabolically designed and demoniacally executed. Western civilization has transferred the huge structure to this speck of dust with the help of science and morals, instead of transplanting heaven upon it, which was its original intention. The result may be appropriately compared to what resulted from the churning of the ocean by the gods of the Hindu pantheon, producing poison instead of nectar. True culture, sweetness and light, beauties of nature and art, of poetry and philosophy, are all bidding farewell to this world, to make room for dust and smoke, for slums and brothels, for gold and silver, for gilt-edged securities and Green-backs, for the beastly struggle for existence, for all the temptations of life, for all the "good things of life", for all that deprives life of its quality of being worth living.

The mistake discovered by pragmatism that while making provision for the intellectual and moral evolution of man, God neglected to make similar provision for his own evolution, is visibly undermining faith in the existence of the unseen world. Man has advanced far since Adam's time, but God remains where He was on the first day of creation. So long as human progress was slow God was able to accommodate Himself to the slight alterations in human intelligence and character, that took place from century to century. But in the nineteenth century the progress was unprecedentedly extravagant, and past experience proved inadequate for the necessary rate of change in His intelligence and moral sense. In other words God failed to keep pace with man in the race of evolution, and this failure is betraying itself with increasing helplessness in the twentieth century. The chasm between divine and human nature is widening. Such widening of the chasm is not altogether unique, though extremely rare in history. In olden times prophets used to receive messages from heaven for an honourable settlement of differences and collisions between God and man. But the transnebular cable has been cut by the submarine of science, slowly, silently, invisibly through the decades, so as to isolate the two worlds from each other. No body knows now how affairs are conducted in that world. Agnostics declare that it is not merely unknown but unknowable ; and western civilization is desparately trying to manage the affairs of this world by its own unaided power. It is no wonder its methods do not follow the beaten track or old customs, and their old womanishness. It strikes out new tracks

for itself on the sea of life, and boldly steams on, as Carlyle disapprovingly declares, "without rudder, chart and compass". It is meandering between Scylla and Charybdis, between capitalism and socialism, between masculinism and feminism, between idealism and naturalism, between theism and atheism, between deism and dispensationism, between nationalism and universalism, between absolutism and humanism, between personalism and pantheism, or Vedantism, and so forth. It has so far fairly succeeded in finding accommodating terms between opposites, but the future is becoming extremely problematical. International treaties are scraps of paper. Treaties between nature and supernature, one is tempted to say, between God and the devil, can have no higher value. Western civilization has been escaping from jeopardous salients so far by such treaties. Nationalism is pretending to reduce its destructive power, while reinforcing its destructive appetites. Earth hunger has lost its prominence, but the hunger of profits and of subtle political influences is increasing. Armies and navies are reduced, while the desire for leadership and ascendancy is increasing. Church endowments are increasing, while the pews are emptying. Fabianism rules the world between capitalism and socialism. Agnosticism rules between theism and atheism. The international league pretends to bridge the gulf between nationalism and universalism. The compromise between personalism and absolutism is an old one, now grown hazardously rickety. The controversy between unity and trinity is now limited to the stipendiaries of the church. Such trivialities have long since lost their power and prominence. The most prominent but perilous settlement between opposites is the treaty of doubts.

The treaty of doubts is the most important instrument in the history of human life and civilization. Without it the life of man would be perennially in a precarious, parlous condition. Unlike the treaty of Versailles or any other treaty of which we have any record in history, it requires no sanction and is automatically enforced. It brings peace to life, lived among the warring elements of human nature. But it is an imperfect instrument, a clumsily drafted document, bristling with catastrophic clauses and pregnant with ultimate destruction. Truth and untruth, light and darkness, faith and infidelism, good and evil, happiness and misery, nobility and meanness, gravity and frivolity, growth and decay, creation and destruction, affirmation and negation, egoism and altruism,

love and hate, sincerity and hypocricy all find reconciliation in the twilight of doubt. Such reconciliation has never been perfectly satisfactory, and never can be, and the question is whether it will enable man and civilization to live on for ever.

Doubt is the foundation on which the edifice of belief is built by the will-to-believe, the greatest architect in the history of science, history and religion. But it is pragmatic belief after all, and is wofully changeful. Absolute belief would make progress impossible. The heavens submitted themselves for long ages to the tyrrany of Ptolemy, and then dethroned him in favour of Copernecus, who was followed by Kepler. Kepler was displaced by Newton, and belief in the principia after having kept man imprisoned for a couple of centuries, is now being partially dismantled in favour of a German, astronomer-philosopher named Einstein. The belief in the existence and nature, numerical and psychological, of God has undergone many wonderful changes. Animism, polytheism, henotheism, atheism. Monotheism, amphitheism, tritheism, pantheism, vedantism, atomism, agnosticism, and so forth are the various sartorial costumes in which God has appeared to or disappeared from man. The real absolute soul of God has never been discovered, and is not likely to be discovered by western civilization, to which doubt appears at last to have brought ultimate spiritual peace by the formula that whether He exists or not, and whatever His nature He is a pragmatic superfluity, that leaves the will-to-believe, untouched, unaffected, unafflicted, unconcerned. Old enthusiasms of the religious world are now dead.

Doubt is the mother of diabolical suspicion, from which individual colliding with individual, community colliding with community, nation colliding with nation now suffers more conspicuously than ever before. Doubt never grows old. It enjoys the vigour of eternal youth, like the invisible king, who has sent his latest message to H. G. Wells (God the Invisible King.) Nay it grows in vigour with the progress of civlization for obvious reasons. The very existence of civilization demonstrates on all sides that man has dispensed with the dispensations of God, and has learnt to manage his own affairs unaided. Advancing civilization implies growing isolation between God and man. Instead of depending upon God man learns to depend upon himself. He learns to coerce nature instead of being coerced by it, and if, as Herbert Spencer alleges, nature is the mode

in which the inscrutable supreme power manifests itself, then it follows that civilized man coerces God, and to expect him to worship the latter is to expect the master to worship the slave. That is the salient in the field of belief to which western civilization is rapidly approaching. That is the secret of the conflict between religion and science. Every new conquest of science implies miles of retreat for religion and faith in God. Western science has advanced most, and the nearest God, the God of Christendom, has retreated most. Reason, not rationalism, has put God to flight. The atmosphere of science wofully tingles the nostrils of God, and he runs away out of olfactory disgust ; he does not retreat before volleys of rationalistic grapeshot. Poison gas, not machine gun, has put the gods to flight. It is the attraction or repulsion of atmospheric odour that invigorates or debilitates the Gods.

GOD'S PLACE IN CIVILIZATION.

The desire to take thought for the morrow is the starting point of civilization in the psychology of man. This desire manifests itself in the form of the question, 'What food shall I eat to-morrow ? 'How shall I find it ?' The first question is asked in the evening, when after the fatigue of the day the man goes to bed after eating the last meal. The second may be asked either at dawn next morning or at once. The man who asks the first question has advanced further in civilization than one who does not ask it. The man who asks the second question is still more civilized. The most civilized man is one who answers the second question before falling asleep. As he asks these questions and answers them, a voice whispers into his ears, "Infidel ! learn to depend upon me ; you are helpless ; a mere instrument in my hands ; a slave at my command ; thy food and raiment will be supplied if you are faithful ; if you are not you will be cast into the hands of the devil, and you will die, and you will be consigned to eternal perdition." This is an amplified form of the answer given by God just as man begins his first struggle for civilization. This is the place of God in general civilization, and this is emphatically the place of the Christian God in western civilization. Later on the latter God enters upon further amplification thus—"You 'd—d fool, have you no recollection of the past ?

Are you not descended from Adam and Eve? Are you unaware of the law of inheritance? Have you knowledge of the way in which I dealt with your first parents when by dire disobedience they ate of the forbidden fruit, and offended me so egregiously that I, unable to check myself, expelled them from Paradise and cursed them to eat bread in the sweat of their face, and to fill the world with a brood of rascals whose hunger would be insatiable, and whose lust would create faster than my agents, plague, pestilence and homicide can destroy. I have now tentatively relented a little, and come personally among you to admonish you again and to assure you that if you cease to think of the morrow, and therefore never think of taking your affairs into your own hands, you will find salvation after death.

Frightened by this minatory attitude of the father of mankind the Nordic races of the woods and glades of Europe, mere savages, whose hearts were impregnated with the seeds of the highest civilization, superficially transferred their allegiance to Him, but at heart they were only one part Christian and six parts pagan of the rudest type. The blended allegiance lasted for a thousand years, after which inspired by the Gods of Greece and Rome, who had helped to rear the highest civilizations of ancient times, mere national Gods, who never aspired to universal dominion, but who loved and hated with discrimination, and who taught more by example than by sermon and precepts, who taught men to pursue the accessible and the possible, and never bothered about the impossible, I say under the subtle influence of these Gods, western civilization shook off his faltering, halting, hesitant mood, and resumed the management of his own affairs energetically, assiduously, enthusiastically, audaciously, almost definantly.

In a short time he turned the universe topsy turvy, enlarged the lamps and flowers of the skies into mammoths, million fold larger than the earth, commanded the ever running, incessantly spinning, sun to stand still; hammered the rectangular flat earth into rotundity, and sent it whirling in space bound by the tether of centrifugality at one end, with the other end held by the sun In short, he turned a considerable portion of the universe from the geocentric to the helio-centric mode of living. Western civilization now began life by civilizing the heavenly bodies and organising them into an intelligible and useful system of life. On the earth itself his

achievements were of greater pragmatic value. He crossed the oceans in ferry boats ; sent expeditions to the antipodes where men walked on their heads, and trees grew from top downwards. He explored and exploited, enslaved or extirpated the peoples living overseas, squatted on their lands, and plundered their actual and potential property ; converted denizens into citizens, coloured skins into white skin, colonies into independent states ; and changed the language, religion, race, custom and modes of living prevailing in the New world, bringing them into line with what existed in the old. In short he magically expanded himself over more than half the earth.

God opposed him tooth and nail while he was engaged in drastically dealing with the heavens, hammering the earth, spinning it round its axis, and whirling it round the sun, and playing mischief with the planets, and destroying the aesthetic beauties of the universe. He tortured and tormented him cruelly at times ; burnt Bruno alive, and kept Galileo in prison till he, like Peter, denied the truth and paid homage to the God of un-truths and half truths. But adversity only served to strengthen his "unconquerable will". God felt like what he did when Satan delivered his ever memorable speech to Beelzebub, rolling in the visible darkness of sulphur vapour. But when western civilization began to deal with the New World He retreated from the scene of action, lulled into slumber by the prospect of new worshippers, unacquainted with Greek or Roman civilization, for missionaries accompanied the expeditions. Small comfort for the God of the universe ? But even this seldom went beyond the potential stage, the stage of hope and uncertainty.

God finally ceased to worry about His dominion over the heavens and accepted the new condition, when after the publication of Newton's Principia He became convinced that it was impossible to restore the old organization by hammering the earth back to its flat rectangularity, or whirling back the solar system to its geocentric condition. As to the earthly achievements of western civilization God sneakily claimed a share in the constructive achievements which followed the destructive exploitations and extirpations. America, South Africa and Australia are great because the builders worked with His blessing. He claimed all the credit for the abolition of slavery, but repudiated all insinuations as to His connection with the introduction of it, and with its continuation for three

centuries. The habit of thanking God for everything great without cursing Him for anything that is mean and immoral, does not enhance His dignity or his power and prestige, but serves to show that He is a non-entity, the monarch of a Democracy, a titular emperor of Delhi.

The morrow is not limited to a single drive of the sun in space from east to west. It may extend to the end of eternity. An indefinite future is a natural, and therefore acceptable, interpretation of it. Successful thought for the morrow in this acceptable form may lead to complete segregation of man from God. The idea substituted by western civilization for that of the immortality of the soul that a man lives in his children, and through them in his grand children as a multifurcated soul, has led him to take thought for the indefinite future, on the principle of self-preservation, and every man takes pride in the reflection that his ancestors were great and good enough to make provision for his raiment, nourishment and shelter for generations. Property, as I have shown before, is destructive of faith ; and Christ, wofully aware of this fact, addressed himself to poor men who had ceased to take thought for the morrow, because they were helpless, and none of their thoughts for the same was likely to be of any avail. If true culture accompanied poverty instead of property the divine mission might have had much better success. The opposition between culture and fa.th has been a stumbling block ın God's way. Faıth decays with the growth of culture. From whatever point of view one looks at western cıvilization, one finds nothing but insults and affronts inflicted upon God.

Saving for consumption is condonable. But saving used as capital is egregious, and western civilization derives its chief characteristic feature from Industrialism. Indeed 'Industrial civilization' is one of its prominent names. Rebellious subjects behead their kings and exhibit their heads publicly. Infidels behead their eternal God. Capitalism is the guillotine with which they behead Him.

The enormous capital gathered by western civilizat.on not only makes God functionless or pragmatically an imposture, but enables a small miniority of men to enslave the vast majority. It might be expected that the latter oppressed by western civilization would appeal to God for relief. But every man howsoever he may protest his socialism, is a capitalist at heart, and therefore a rebellious creature of God. Instead of appealing to God they

appeal to the animistic spirit of combination and to trades unionism. Neither the rich nor the poor are loyal to the Christian God.

No doubt the capitalists maintain at their own cost a vast hierarchy of priests and preachers, but they do so with a sinister object. While themselves sneering at the sermon on the mount, and betraying their infidelism by the tone and tune of their lives, they show their utmost solicitude to keep their workers in the path to the "kingdom of heaven, to comfort and to the inheritance of the earth", while securing their property from the trespass and theft of the poor and needy, and keeping them in divine exploitable simplicity by products of their charity.

Christ said :—"Blessed are the poor in spirit : for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are they that mourn : for they shall be comforted. Blessed are the meek ; for they shall inherit the earth".

The Church going, mission supporting capitalists seem almost desirous of restoring the earth to the poor whom they forcibly disinherited ! But under the influence of socialism the latter pay more loyal attention to Proudhan and other leaders of the movement, who identify all property with stolen property. The association of Christian faith with Industrialism and Life Insurance adventures seems to be the highest achievement in the history of impiety.

The general attitude of the capitalist towards God is one of enigmatic sarcasm, turned from literature into actual life. He seems to take pride in declaring himself the truly faithful servant of God in his dealings with the working poor. God condemned them to hard labour : he has intensified that labour. God made them fugitives on the earth : he has made them permanently homeless. God made their women fertile : he has increased their fertility. But while God included the capitalist in these curses, he has excused himself. He follows the example of God, but he does so with a diabolical discrimination. He is suffused with piety on the skin, but is filled with impiety under it. Socialism is trying to turn the table upon him. It has made him tremulous and pessimistic. He is however fighting on, losing ground inch by inch, hoping to be relieved by some divine dispensation, in which he has not lost faith altogether, provided it proves favourable to him. He does not curse God retaliatorily but tries to evade Him. The general depression

of trade has filled him with consternation, but he is determined not to pray to God for salvation : he is trying by the help of Satan who is more accessible than God, to relieve the situation by empire free-trade mixed with high tariff for extra-imperial trade, to preserve nationalism by sending humanism into the melting pot.

Dehortations from addiction to the habit of taking thoughts for the morrow is not peculiar to the Christian and Islamic Gods, bifurcations of the Jewish God, named Jahveh, but are common to all Gods personal and finite, who pretend to be infinite and eternal. The animistic and polytheistic Gods who knew their own imperfections, and were aware of their finitude, were free from this hortatoriness. God is a treasure distinct from minted silver and gold characterised by a lower potency for attraction. He is therefore naturally averse to savings. Generally Gods add woman to gold as a corrupting influence destructive of faith. In Hindu philosophy Kamini-kanchan is a united impediment in the way of faith and salvation. The inferiority of women is emphasised in all masculinistic philosophy. That may be an excusable idea. But to regard woman as if she owed her origin to a moment of lapse in divine mentality is outrageous. In the mosaic cosmogony Eve is represented as something like a sister's daughter to the devil, who taking advantage of Adam's absence at prayer time, lured her into the most infamous act of disobedience, and through her laid the foundation of civilization.

It does not require much erudition to point out that saving is destructive of faith. It makes prayer superflous, and enables man to depend upon himself instead of depending upon God. The most important clause in the daily prayer loses its significance in the mouth of a man who has baked bread overnight. There are now millions of men who have perpetually in their possession, bread earned without hard labour. But even supposing hard labour to be the inevitable cost of bread, such labour is less taxing than the cost paid in the shape of unswerving faith in a tantalising heart-searching being who irrationally claims the advantage of transparent visibility in penumbric light. Reading the daily prayer side by side with the original curse it appears that God regarded the comfortable life as the result of an alternative process of faith and hard labour. All civilizations have preferred the second course. Western civilization has done so more emphatically and with greater resolution

than any other. So far it is honourable and praiseworthy. Its unrighteousness appears when it imposes the labour on one, and reserves the comfort for another individual.

The will-to-believe, the will to power, the will to ascendancy and leadership ultimately lead to the will to defy the authority of God. They almost presuppose such definace. The vivid, virile, manful life carries with it the idea of self-sufficiency and self-reliance. Such a life is resourceful in danger and does not think of kneeling down for prayer. Western civilization has now nearly arrived at this majestic, noble, divine frame of mind.

The idea of supreme power, prestige and comfort as the climacteric point in human progress was unconsciously stirring in the mind of Christ, when he delivered the sermon in the mount. The very first verses of that sermon distinguish between actual and potential blessings. Actual blessings belong to the rich, the powerful and the comfortable. Potential blessings belong to their opposites, the poor, the powerless and the miserable. That is the law of the Christian faith. Western civilization is now in actual possession, and is determined to retain it to the end of time. It defies the law. It defies the law giver, and his rotatorial design. Facts demonstrate that the latter is in a tremulous nervous condition. The failure of the divine scheme to establish an outpost in the form of a kingdom of God on earth has encouraged western civilization to contemplate an ideal independent kingdom of plenty and prosperity, a kingdom where man will eat bread without sweat in his face, where he will build a permanent palatial home, and not live like a fugitive or a vagrant, and where he will enjoy sexual pleasures without the danger of over-population. It has advanced far, though it has much uphill work before it. But the more it advances the more does God feel the parlousness of His position. Luckily, the mortar used by it is defective ; there is in it too much of Potassium nitrate, which separates brick from brick in a short time. Thus there are true Christians still in existence in chriestendom, but their number is rapidly decreasing, and the vigour of their faith declining. The Churches are desolate ; the pews are empty. The Cathedrals call attention to the architectural grandeur of the buildings, not to the excellence of the sermons preached within them.

When God, put to the flight by the frightful attitude and activities of science, particularly of astronomy, took shelter in the

woody wilderness of apologetics, He was agreeably surprised to meet there a strange divinified apparition, who had formerly lived in Greece in the Platonic age, and was supposed to have been starved to death in the swamp of theology in the early years of the Christian era, but who had managed to live on incognito in a wordy wilderness through scholastic ages. There was no fierceness or suspiciousness in his looks, and God unhesitatingly trusted himself to his care, for he was helpless and felt almost like an impostor, who had kept the world bound to error for ages. The friendly apparition assured him that it signified nothing whether the sun revolved round the earth or the earth revolved round the sun. Geocentric and heliocentric theories left spiritual life, the true life of man untouched. Man was not created to count the stars or observe the movemenets of the planets. His real life is inward, and not outward. These assurances made God comfortable again. On enquiry he learnt that his host was the son of a strange person called Reason. No body knew his mother at the time, but it afterwards came to be suspected that her name was Imagination. He is now generally known as the "Reasoned God", sharply distinguished from the more intelligible God, known as the "Revealed God." It may be useful to remark here that the parentage of the strange God is obscured in a cloud of suspicion. A vulgur person named Intuition sometimes claims to have begotton Him. Philosophy has ennobled this person and placed Him above reason in the order of precedence The Illative sense is another claimant, whose case was supported by Cardinal Newman, a very able counsel who practised in the spiritual court, and who found interlocutory verdict for Revelation against Reason, by proving the superior claim of the strange upstart, who died as soon as the grammar of Assent went out of print. Some people are of opinion that this new God was born in the subliminal region of the mind where he was discovered and adopted by Reason.

God soon discovered that His Host was like a chamelion that changed his colour and character with the utmost subtlety and cleverness. From Descartes to Darwin is not a very far cry in terms of time. Within this short period He has changed Himself from a comparatively harmless being into a monster, a very Dragon, a connoisseur of human flesh, a carrion eater, a mysterious discriminator of human values, a shrouded propagator of a beastly morality, who in the name of natural selection daily celebrates a million fold hecatomb at the Bacchanalian orgy of the struggle for existence,

and throws the corpses into the boundless catacomb of Natural Rejection. Mr. Bernard Shaw points out that His object is to improve the human race, to raise it into the race of supermen, a race of civilized barbarians, of cultured nomads, man-eaters equipped with gun-powder and diplomatic shrewdness, by the human method of "trial and error". But the formidable disparity between the selections and the rejections, and the parity between the trials and the errors has so terrified the God of Christianity that with all His youthful extravagances of the past He finds it ignominious to live as a spunger upon the hospitality of such a monster. The origin of species is not the sole Bible of the new faith. Lyall's geology, Nietzsche's philosophy, including "Will to power" and "Beyond good and evil", Jame's Pragmatism, and so forth constitute the New Testament of faith. In the nineteenth century Comte, Mill, Spencer and Huxley played the part of John the Baptist. The German Weismann acted the part of St. Paul in this new religion by adding the theory of degeneration to that of regeneration, and Weismannism stands to Darwinism as Paulism stands to Christicism.

Benjamin Kidd in his attempt to reconcile Christianity with Darwinism has created a God out of the flesh of the first and the blood of the second, a demonaical mixture which has enabled the white man to conquer the planet, which promises to turn the world from multi-racial to uni-racial, from multi-lingual to unilingual humanity. He thinks that western civilization has borrowed the corporate, collective, socialistic life from Christianity, and the ethical monstrosities of circumstantial selection, the developed humanized aspect of Natural Selection, from Darwin who might well have said, with reference to the law of Nordic life and its development, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the Prophets. I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil." Nothing is impossible for western civilization. Nothing is too great or too mean for it. But Kidd's philosophy is scoffed at as "a curiosity, not a contribution to thought." However the desire for leadership and ascendancy, which according to Kidd is the dominating factor in national life, may in the long run bring about the desired consummation, leaving the world to try a new experiment in the ethico-cosmic process of multifurcation to relieve the stagnation and boredom of uniformity.

It would be unfair to dismiss the reasoned God in the aspect in which he seems to have appeared to Darwin as the spiritual

creator of the natural law of natural selection. I have said the reasoned God changes colour like a chameleon. Colour includes colour of the heart, that is, character. Varna in the Hindu caste system carries with it the idea of character. The whiteman has not only a pure colour and skin, but it is supposed to possess a pure character underneath. The Arya in India was a whiteman, both inside and out. Columbus and his men were supposed to be descended from heaven as they landed in the Island of Guanahani. When the chameleon changes colour, it changes its character, that is, its mood, which is a passing form of character.

I say the reasoned God has a changeful character. The most marvellous, one might say, the most miraculous change in God's character took place when Darwin discovered the law of Natural selection. The post Darwinian God is not the same God as the one, the contemplation of whose spendour, magnificence, charity and goodness brought to the heart of the philosopher, consolation touched with intellectual pride or self consciousness, that is, consciousness of a corresponding goodness in Him. As a rule the reasoned God begins life as a being thoroughly in contrast with human being. He is infinite, eternal and absolute ; man is finite mortal and dependent. He ends by being one with man, by changing and uplifting man from his finitude, his mortality and dependence. Man has reason to feel proud in the communion with such a God. The Darwinian dragon can bring to the heart of a reasonable man no such pride. If he were not cowardly, malicious to submerged, disinherited neighbours, irrationally optimistic and meanly selfish, man would morally as well as intellectually and spiritually reflect the Dragon posing as a God. Darwinians lay stress on the potential goodness of their God, and connive at His actual malignity. They think only of natural selection, and pass by natural rejection as a matter of no importance to them. No body now a days gives any thought to the poor, the infirm, the helpless, the miserable, the failures of life in society. The rich and the successful absorb all the attention, for admiration or denunciation. The submerged are ignored.

Under these circumstances the most striking question to the mind is, "If the Darwinian God, that is, the God whose character is logically deducible from the law of Natural Rejection, automatically followed by Natural Selection, on the Spencerian principle

that nature is the mode in which the supreme inscrutable power manifests himself to human consciousness, is such a devouring demon, how does it happen that this God has in so short a time become so popular among philosophers and philistines alike?" Mr. Shaw calculates that he is intensely popular among all classes of people. Literature written on social subjects in the post-Darwinian period is hardly considered readable unless it contains some reverential reference to this God. Books on philosophy which neither specifically reject nor emphatically accept the truth of biological evolution, or even of mere psychical evolutions are anachronisms, which critics treat with silent contempt. Culture in this age can claim no recognition unless it manifests a knowledge of, a power of forming an opinion on, nay, a familarity with, that famous law.

The answer to the question lies in the fact that in western civilization all other Gods, that have existed, or still exist in the civilized or savage world, have been weighed in the balance and found wanting. They afford very inadequate satisfaction to the modern human conscience, or to human aspiration. The Darwinian God is the latest God, reasoned out of the environments in which the civilized nations live, move and have their being at the present day; and He is the most up-to-date God, fashioned to fit modern tastes and temperaments. The greatest drawback in His education and character is that he is in the habit of drinking human blood and eating human flesh, with a preference for meat, and diseased, discoloured, half-stagnant blood. The consequence is that the weak and the helpless go into His maw first. The culpability of this habit is no doubt partially redeemed by the promise which He gives of the higher value which will accrue to the human race in the long run, by the promise which He gives of the expected, automatic transformation of man into superman, or in other words, the promise of the gradual progress of western civilization, scientifically in height, and politically in expansion. The promise, it is supposed, will attain its highest fulfilment when the entire world is civilized on western methods, and when the destructive and constructive energy of man will evenly balance with the destructive and constructive energy of God; in power and moral character, possibly also in the intellectual and emotional traits. It may be added that the peculiar habit of eating lean meat and drinking rotten blood will gradually purify itself with the scarcity of such meat and blood, that is, with the inevitable improvement in these elements

of the human body, for the survivals of the present day struggle will find their end in quick elimination or rejection with the progress of evolution, or in other words, the progress of civilization. The strong of the present day will be the weak of the future. The quality of God's food and drink will improve immensely. We hate cruelty to the weak and helpless. This is the general rule. But it is probable that the disapprobation of cruelty to the weak and helpless is strongest among those who are themselves weak and helpless. The rational mind ought to have no sympathy with them. They corrupt humanity and impede the progress of civilization, that is, the ultimate salvation of man. The habit of thinking an obstructive relic of more primitive times that Heaven helps those who help themselves is superannuated. The period of transition is characterised necessarily by great confusion, and the most important problem for western civilization is how to rid society of the poor, the helpless, the humble, the meek, the weak and infirm without causing violenc to custom and convention and other psychological incrustations. The method at present followed is that of slow starvation and increasing contraception, in which I include compulsory abstention. What appeared to be cruel and immoral to our forefathers have already lost much of their sting, and future generations will find wisdom, generosity and lofty morality in them. Western civilization has largely tranformed the ethical psychology of human nature. It is destined to complete the work in a short time unless marooned by adverse forces, like Napoleon in St. Helena. Thepsychology of the Darwinian God, the latest incarnation of thesupreme inscrutable power is in excellent harmoney with that of the majority of minds, cultivated and uncultivated, acquainted or unacquainted with the exact significance of the law of natural selection, and man and God are in perfect mutual co-operation. Here lies the secret of the popularity of this new divinity.

This explanation may be found to be open to the criticism that it covertly presupposes that God is created by man in his own image, that is popular only so long as He and the majority of men ethically think alike, and that man being subject to evolution, and God being absolutely fixed, He becomes increasingly unpopular with age. Old Gods are thus automatically rejected and replaced by new ones. The God of Darwinism will probably undergo the same fate in course of time, and though at present He is supremely

popular, His risks are greater than those of the Gods of ancient times, because He is the author and advocate of evolution. He may try to retain His popularity by subjecting himself to the humiliation of evolution, but success is problemetical. All Gods have submitted themselves to such humilition but have failed to keep pace with the evolution of man. Christ submitted Himself to evolution and the result is that he, as he was in his youth, is no longer recognizable in what he was in his old age. Oecumenical councils, pontifical bulls, protestantism, puritanism, Wesleyianism, unitarianism, and other 'isms' have treated him like a foot ball, an expression which seems irreverent at present but will soon become popular. Evolution makes the atmosphere uncongenial to old Gods. No philosophic arguments can displace them, and I have given none. God may not be actually created by man, as a king may not be created by His subjects ; but God is absolutely comparable to the king of a limited monarchy who retains His throne by dint of ditto and loses it by the perversity of veto.

The gods of philosophy are as numerous as there are philosophers of real worth and individuality. They are never popular, because the popular mind cannot grasp them. Even the philosophers do not grasp them, and the number of philosophers is infinitesimal in the world. They have not much to do with civilization. They are generally pessimistic in their outlook, and are an impediment to the progress of civilization. They see more gloom and misery in the world than ordinary men. Philosophers form a class by themselves. They have a tendency to detach themselves from the world, which they partially or completely renounce. If their Gods, which may properly be designated as their world views, were enthroned for worship, the practical life of the world would come to an end, and humanity would be turned into a world of contemplation and pensiveness and negation of life. There would be no sweat, no conception, no continuation of population, no commerce, no industry, no politics no communal disputes no international war. The world would be buried in the peace of annihilation.

These Gods are made of the mixed clay of infinity, eternity and ubiquity, and their souls are made of absoluteness, omnipotence, omniscience and universal, unintermittent love. Yes, they love men ; but are not wholly free from discriminative tastes. They are, however, very pugnacious and aggressive among themselves.

This is evident from the fact that there is no book on philosophy in modern times which does not devote nine parts to sword cuts and pinpricks inflicted on rival Gods or Gods of rival philosophers. Criticism forms the beginning, the middle and the end of all such books. Truth is the monopoly of each of them, and thefts and usurpations are ruthlessly resented, and Truth means the power to cut falsehood to pieces. Their proselytising activities are limited, because philosophers alone are acceptable for conversion, and every philosopher is too firmly attached to his own God to acknowledge any good in any other God.

Of course, mere world views are generally barren. They become Gods when they have gathered a congregation. They may bring consolation to the ulcerated heart at times, and intellectual pride to those who discover them and propagate them. They leave the average man untouched in practical life. But there are world views which make no distinction between culture and philistinism, and are accessible to most men, educated, half-educated and illiterate. Darwin's view of the world and of life is of this kind. It has justly acquired the right to godhood. This God has transferred universal brotherhood into universal cousinhood, for though He speaks of a common parent for all living beings from insect to man, He has driven him into such an unfathomable pit that no body thinks of showing any reverence to him, or any love to his collateral progeny. Indeed reverence for ancestors, even for near ones, is losing ground. Men have begun to think lightly of them, and even to insinuate that they are nearer to beasts than themselves. Huxley, when asked by his wife to write a book about his family, silenced her by saying that his attention was too deeply absorbed in the contemplation of his old arborial ancestors to leave much time for the study of his near ancestors. This spirit of irreverence is the essence of Darwinism. It has its pragmatic value in the fact that reverence for less advanced people is one of the forces that causes national degeneration. How long could the British people retain possession of the Indian Empire, if they showed much reverence for Hindu philosophy, art and literature? Europeans like Huxley, have more reverence for their Nordic ancestors than for their Christian ancestors of later ages, because the latter were degenerates, cosmically weakened, and ethically not advanced by the contamination, received through Christ, of eastern world views. It would do the world much good if all the histories and biographies and poems

of these degenerate times were consigned to the fire. The fate of the Alexandrian library is irrelevant, because the Darwinian world view was unknown when it was destroyed. But the destruction was good for Islam, for it prevented for the time being its contamination by Greek philosophy, which subsequently weakened it at Cordova and Barcelona.

One or more of the reasoned Gods sometimes enter into the body of a mythological God, and enhance his value and dignity. The Hindu pantheon is overcrowded with such mixed beings. Sometimes a mythological God is possessed with several philosophic spirits. Krishna was a mixture of the Vedantic Brahma and the Darwinian God. He was love and strife, Krishna and Kali, in combination. He created the religion of love, turned into Freudian love, for the failures of society. He half-annihilated the world of men in his character of Kali with the object of sweeping off vice and weakness, the object which is precisely the principle and justification of the Darwinian struggle for existence, and the survival of the fittest, that is, for purposes of ethical selection. The war of Kurukshetra was the culminating point in the struggle between virtue and vice, power and weakness, culture and ignorance, faith and infidelism. Krishna was the inspirer of this great war, and in the Gita he justified it on the principle on which the theory of natural selection is based, namely, the annihilation of the vicious for the purpose of extinguishing vice. The vicious are those who are unfit for survival; and virtue manifests itself in victory and success in life. The virtuous of the present day will be the vicious of the next generation, and the ultimate struggle will be a war of titans, giants slightly differing from one another in stature, cunning, muscularity and circumspecting and circumventing power.

In this discourse on the history of the Gods I have deliberately refrained from giving any personal opinion, for that would be irrelevant. I have merely dwelt on what western civilization preponderantly thinks of them.

THE FOURTH EMPIRE : THE EMPIRE OF RACIALITY

If the devil had any part in the creation of the English language the words 'race' 'religion' and 'nation' must owe their origin to his inventive genius. They are all leavened with hate for neighbour. They lie at the root of most of the wars that have devastated the world from prehistoric ages and are still desolating it. Their index finger always turns to difference. It seldom points to likeness. Race lives in blood, religion in bile, and nation in spleen. Race ridicules the biblical fact which enabled Martin Chuzzlewit to trace his descent, like all the Christian monarchs of the world, in a direct line from Adam, and is therefore anti-Christian. Plurality of religion is a direct defiance of God—the infinite, eternal and absolute god. One nation never loves another except temporarily for a given purpose. But one nation may hate another perpetually and without intermission.

In the tyranny of words, that of 'race' is the most conspicuous. This word may mean, among other things, (most of which imply competition, conflict, hate, pungency etc.) either the entire human family or the descendants of a common ancestor. No body knows in how many generations the descendants of a common ancestor constitute a race. Logically speaking there may be races and sub-races issuing from a single couple. But the common ancestors being unknown sub-races become confused with races, and the general tendency is towards the multifurcation of races. This tendency is countered by natural and circumstantial selection, but for which humanity would have been divided into thousands of races by now. These kinds of selection have been absent from India for ages with the result that the castes perennially grow in number, and now count about two thousand and four hundred.

Ethnology which is designed to throw light on the subject has made confusion worse confounded by its illicit intercourse with politics. No man of science can tell whether an Englishman belongs to the Anglo-Saxon, Aryan, Caucasian, Nordic or Iberian race. The solution now belongs to the science of politics, and every man must be racially judged, among other things by his national interests and religious idiosyncrasies. Politics can mould and remould the race of a man or a group of men at pleasure, when it

belongs to a powerful nation. It can turn a Teuton into a Hun, a Jew into an Englishman or a German. It can divide the people of Europe into Picts and Scots, Celts and Slavs, Teutons and Latins, and can roll them up all into Nordics. The law of naturalization has greater power than the law of Nature. This naturalization has enabled the Jews to rule the world, and recent history points to the conclusion that God was right in his choice of the chosen people.

The race of a man is supposed to be written on his face, in his physiognomy, in his hair, in his jawbone, and cheek-bone, in his nostrils, his eyes, his skull and on his skin. There may be some absolute truth in this, but most of its reality is subjective, relative, pragmatic.

How can we know whether a man is an Englishman, a Scotsman, an Irishman or a German? I do not include the Frenchman because until sometime ago he could be known by the peculiar cut of his beard, called the French-cut. But beards are now drastically dealt with by a change in the aesthetic taste of the civilized world. Until recently the meeting of the Indian Congress presented a confused medley of head dress by which the Madrassi could be at once distinguished from the Mahratti, the Mahratti from the Marwari, the Marwari from the Behari, the Behari from the Bengali, and the Hindusthani from the Punjabi, the Dravidian from the Scythian, the Scythian from the Aryan, and the Aryan from the Mongolian.

Having once found that they were different the official ethnologist would have no difficulty in tracing sartorial differences to anatomical ones. Differences of language would at once come to his help for the purpose of drafting a report on the impossibility of an Indian nation issuing out of such a miscellaneous population. I am not aware if Mr. Risley attended a meeting of the Congress in the nineteenth century. But I am sure if he had attended one in the twentieth century he would have thrown away all his ethnological apparatus as illusive auxiliaries of personal and national equation.

William James would have found in the head dress of the nineteenth century evidence regarding racial plurality existing in India, for the dress of a man is part of his real self, and it cannot be regarded as a part of reality outside of the latter. Philosophy goes deeper than politics in the quest of unlikeness.

Now, how to distinguish between the Englishman and the Irishman? Was Burke an Englishman or an Irishman? Is Mr. Shaw an Irishman or an Englishman? So far as language is concerned they are both Englishmen. The opposite mistake is made by Indians who find no difference between one European and another; between a Norman and a Latin, between a Teuton and a Slav : between a Scandinavian and an Italian. Perhaps the Indian mind is predisposed to see likeness in Humanity, while western predisposition runs in an opposite direction for purposes of exploitation. Man is necessarily pragmatic in his psychology. The Indian calls the Australian an Englishman. He offended Mr. Morrison, son, author of "New Ideas in India" by this strange illusion, unaware of Mr. Charles Lamb's enquiry as to the number of generations in which an Englishman living in Australia became metamorphosed into an Australian, or lost his national profession by the process of extra-British bleaching.

Dean Inge finds a medley of races in Ramsay MacDonald, Lord Balfour, Lloyd George and Lord Roberts, Lord Reading and Lord Cecil, and regrets that England is now ruled not by Englishmen, but by Irishmen, Welshmen, Jews and Scots. To him they look like a "motley crew of eight-anna Eu, Russian and Jew" though they rule Britain by their collective power.

Ethnology is corrupted by politics, and politics is contaminated by pride, and pride is arbitrary, and arbitrariness is antithetical to science. Ethnology is thus not a science. It is an illusion, albeit, a very powerful one. It divides humanity against itself. Natural and circumstantial selection tries hard to obliterate existing divisions, but they also create new ones. Between the creative and destructive influence of ethnology western civilization is kept in a good working order, full of animation, energy and power, full of pugnacity and war-psychology, and therefore full of greatness, magnificence, splendour and wonder. Without the ethnological consciousness the west would never differentiate from the east, the aboriginal races would still have flourished in the New World, dark and red skin would have continued to offend white men, and western civilization might still have been struggling in the mire of Christian banality. Ethnology threatens on the one hand to spread the white skin over entire humanity, and on the other to divide white men into Americans, Australians, Canadians, New Zealanders, South

Africanders, without detriment to the perennial conflict between Slavs and Teutons, Latins and Nordics. Some of the denominations of the white skin may disappear in the future, but the present tendency is to increase the number of the kinds of white men by the energy of self-determination, self-interest, nationalism, and the increasing desire for the good things of life and for the highest standard of life, measured by the quality and quantity of food, clothing and shelter, and locomotion by air, land and water.

The illusions of race and religion have caused more desolation among men by circumstantial selection than the law of natural selection has caused in the animal kingdom. The history of the world is primarily a record of wars waged to destroy men in the name of religion and race. Humanity seems to have great powers of resistance against foreign gods and foreign blood, otherwise it would have become unireligious and uniracial by this time. The gods have gradually become peaceful, and no man need die now because he worships a hated god. Between religion and race the latter is more vigorous and warlike though much older than the former. Millions of tribes have been extinguished to form a race, and there are only a few races in existence at the present day. The races are the creations of literature and philosophy on the intellectual, and of pride and haughtiness on the emotional side. Nationalism has largely usurped the place of race in creating hatred instead of love, universal cousinhood instead of universal brotherhood. Naturalization enables a man to change his race and his nationality. The whole subject is in a confused condition, and I shall not try further to unravel the knots.

Two distinct processes are and have always been at work to complicate the race problem. One of them is disjunctive and the other conjunctive. At present the disjunctive process is stronger than the conjunctive. Hate, which lies at the bottom of the disjunctive process, paradoxically helps to reduce the number of races by killing out the weaker races where several races live in juxtaposition with scope for the play of the conjunctive process. On the whole the tendency towards unity is stronger than the tendency towards increasing plurality of races.

Nobody is insincere or ignorant enough to deny that civilization has advanced by predation as well as by production. The real

question is, to which of these factors is it most obliged? We have enough knowledge of Western civilization, for it is the most modern, to emphatically affirm that it owes more to predation than to production. Wealth is a fundamental condition of civilization. The production of wealth requires labour, animal labour, human labour and the labour of machinery. The last is itself wealth. Labouring animals do not share the resulting civilization. Do labouring men share it. Yes, they do in some cases, but to a very small extent. Then, who owns and enjoys the fruits of the resulting civilization? Those who organize that labour and keep it going. How is the organization effected? By force, fraud, intimidation, torture, starvation and privation. By creating and adding keenness to hunger, thirst, lust and other appetites in the labourers. By increasing their will-to-live, by decreasing their will-to-power and by using other contrivances such as religion, morality, institution of marriage and other illusions, that cause degeneration, weak nerves, bad digestion and pathological personality.

Civilization mixes up predation and production in such a way that they become indistinguishable from each other. The predative element becomes subtle and almost invisible. This gives an unspeakable advantage to the predator who can carry on his profession without exposing himself to adverse casuistic criticism. When predation attains the quality of invisibility it is called exploitation. Exploitation lies at the bottom of commercialism. Entire Western civilization is now commercialistic, and therefore exploitive. Mutual exploitation ends in war. Cessation of exploitation leads to stagnation of civilization. Continued stagnation leads to decadence, and decadence leads to death. Here lies the primal secret of the origin, growth, decline and death of civilization. The life of Western civilization is now in its prime. It still has decades, perhaps centuries of growth before it. But its decadence and death are visible, though only faintly.

Civilization is founded upon exploitation. There are two classes of exploitation, (1) exploitation of nature and (2) exploitation of neighbour. Land, water and air may all be exploited. The exploitable elements of land lie either on the surface or underground. Civilization begins with the exploitation of the surface of the earth. The exploitable quality of the surface of the earth varies in the various parts of it. Land surface derives its value from the fact

that man lives and dwells on it. This value is enhanced by the convenient presence of water and air, and by the manner in which the sun acts upon it. Normal man settled on the spot where the land surface had the highest exploitable value, and started civilization by cultivating it. The earliest civilizations chiefly depended upon the exploitable value of the land surface, as qualified above Later civilizations have shone most by the exploitable value of the ground beneath the surface.

The exploitation of nature, so far, is unobjectionable. But this exploitation to be effective has a tendency to introduce the exploitation of neighbour. Exploitation of neighbour may either bring benefit to the exploiter and mischief to the exploited, or benefit to both in unequal degrees. But man's life is a complex phenomenon, and present benefit may be mixed with potential mischief, and present mischief also may be mixed with potential benefit, though the chances are remote and vaguely discerned. Even the most cunningly devised exploitation betrays its disagreeableness when civilization has advanced to a certain point. Coarse and cross exploitation is readily discerned, and can be maintained only by superior muscular force or accidental power given by exploited natural forces such as explosives, sharp cutting instruments, steam power etc. But these may sooner or later become common property, making resistance to exploitation possible. The superior power of combination among men may be helpful both for exploitation and resistence offered to it. Rivalry in the same field of exploitation has also a great tendency to weaken it, or to increase its subtlety. The totality of forces, natural and human, gathered by advancing civilization has a tendency to diminish exploitation. Western civilization which has thrived by a high tension of exploitation, now finds itself in a tight place, and is growing pessimistic at heart. Resisted by outside neighbours, exploiters are now increasingly engaged in exploiting their children and grandchildren. They are mortgaging the future of civlization for the purpose of preserving it from immediate decadence. The civilized races are running into bankruptcy, intellectual, emotional and economical.

The exploitation of animal life and muscle may be mostly regarded as exploitation of nature. It is true, animals exhibit qualities similar to those of men, but they are so low in the scale of values that they may be regarded as part of external nature as distinguished

from human nature. The exploitation of human muscles begins before agriculture. Animals are exploited in several ways. They supply food and clothing. They also supply labour. They are used as carriers and drawers. They carry riders and their luggage, and draw loads and wheeled carriages. Some animals are still used for hunting. The remuneration they receive is what in the case of human labour is called living wage. Cruelty is practised when living wage is reduced to starvation wage. Food, they supply in the shape of milk and meat. Some people gladly consume milk without scruples, but are kind enough not to touch meat. Others regard meat as legitimate food. According to mosaic cosmology God gave man dominion over beasts, and this dominion it is supposed extends to the consumption of meat. This is probably true, for God himself had a preference for meat, which Abel offered Him, while he had an aversion to wheat, which Cain presented at the Altar. Western civilization has largely followed divine preference in this matter, and a tremendous quantity of meat is daily consumed in the civilized countries with the consciousness of divine righteousness. Animals are fed and even gram-fed in this devouring exploitation. They are paid higher wages for higher profits. The animals are benefited when they eat the gram, and feel the mischief when the butcher's knife is applied to the throat. In the exploitation of draught cattle, the benefits are unequal. Dogs are sometimes given better food, but there intervenes the powerful element of aestheticism. There was a time when dogs used to guard the house and to help in hunting. They have all but ceased to be exploited for these purposes. But still they receive good remuneration, because they satisfy the aesthetic tastes of civilized man. However it is noteworthy that the wolf preferred starvation with freedom to fat limbs fettered with iron.

In the exploitation of neighbour man has followed the lines on which he carried it on in the case of animals. Beef and mutton, wool and skin are taken in exchange for grass and gram from animals. From his neighbour he takes life and muscle, freedom and humanity, culture and dignity to give him bread and water, rags and tenements, rounded with a pauper's grave. The exploiter is rich, the exploited is poor. Presently the first becomes a millionaire in his mansion, and the second a vulgarised skeleton in his slum. After death a place in Westminster Abbey is found for the one, and a packing

case in an unwalled cemetery for the other. Often, even these are wanting. Soldiers are thrown into pits in lump and sailors are comfortably buried in the bed of the sea. They die before breath has expired, and extreme unction is administered in the collective form. Animals are domesticated ; neighbours are enslaved.

The exploitation of woman is worse. Compare what she gives and what she receives in return. Both are transparent ; and neither needs explanation.

The worst form of exploitation is exploitation by foreigners. Foreigners are savage, semi-civilized or fully civilized. The greatest achievement of Western civilization is represented by the extinction of savage life. Until recently more than half the world was filled with such life. What has become of it now ? The face of the earth has been magically changed. It is a dreadful, a terrific magic ! America, Australia, South Africa and the Pacific Islands, which were savage three hundred years ago are now highly civilized. One of them threatens to overpower and rule the rest of the world. The mother has become old, and the child is in blooming youth. But consider the method by which the ineffable transformation has been achieved. In one word the method is exploitation. This frightful exploitation has dissociated the word 'race' from the word 'country.' Red Indians do not live in America and Maories do not live in New Zealand. They have been replaced by Nordics. The centre of civilization is a nomad. It has definitely quitted Madrid. After encamping at Paris, Berlin and London it is now said to have shifted to Washington, where it intends to settle. But it has, running in its veins, the blood of the wandering Jew.

The semi-civilized countries are either degenerates descended from a higher civilization or adolescents growing from a childhood of barbaric cosmicality. India and China belong to the first class ; Central Asia belongs to the second. Japan belonged to this class until the sixties of the last century. Western civilization acts in two distinct ways upon these two types of country, with its peculiar mixture of the cosmic and the ethical elements of life, in which the former has a clearly discernible predominance. India and China in contact with western civilization try to feed upon the super animal elements of the latter, while eschewing the animal elements. They adopt the aesthetic life of the west, divested of its brutish cosmic

life, which they consider to be separable without detriment. Japan with its youthful vigour adopted western civilization in both its aspects. The cosmical aspect of it agreed with her own, though more advanced ; and she did not experience much difficulty in assimilating it. Again the interconnection between the two aspects of civilization is so adjusted that the aesthetic aspect smoothly comes with the cosmic. Japan thus appears to have accomplished in half a century what western civilization has taken four centuries to accomplish. The child learns a language in six months. An old man finds it difficult to learn it in six years. The fact that he has already a language in his possession hinders more than it helps him. Japan's progress is marvellous, but certainly it is not miraculous.

The external manifestations of high civilization in the western countries themselves have been accomplished with great rapidity. They dazzle the eye of the observer. They emanate from internal forces, that is, forces of a psychological nature, which take long to develop. These forces were ready in Japan when they came in contact with western civilization. They were in the full vigour of growing adolescence, and imitation was easy for them. If by a miracle the cosmic psychology of either Japan or of the western countries is taken away, western civilization, as the spectator sees it, will collapse like a house of cards. India and China are trying to adopt this psychology in their old age. They try to do it piecemeal, for a transformation in its totality is not only obstructed by existing, though decadent forces, but is considered undesirable. The ethical life enfeebled by age may strive to revive its vigour with the help of adventitious forces, but it cannot tolerate the brutishness of cosmic life, out of which it issued in the remote past. Some Indian philosophers and poets have tried to conjure up a civilization, with its cosmic psychology eliminated. They think of making the impossible possible. But a life-long vegetarian cannot digest beef and mutton in old age, and chops and cutlets cannot be made with cabbage leaves and cauliflowers. Indians may adopt the hat and the coat of the west, but they cannot assimilate the psychology which makes the extinction of races of mankind, or the psychology which makes the extinction of races of mankind, or the shipment of slaves like ballast from one continent to another, possible. They cannot make slave breeding a leading industry. They cannot behead kings and exterminate the aristocracy. They cannot use

fire and wood, explosives and gases to destroy rivals and competitors in exploitation. They cannot send their brethren into tenements and live peacefully in mansions. They cannot leave their parents to starve at home, while they expose themselves to cannon fire in the field of battle. They cannot eat cakes while their brethren have no bread. At least they cannot find glory in war and massacre.

Western civilization is slowly coming to decadence in these kinds of achievements. The great war has frightened it into something like eastern softness and gentleness. If the aversion to human butchery and refined cannibalism which western politics is betraying at the present time is genuine and sincere, it is entering upon the beginning of its end. But nobody believes that the protestations of western civilization in these matters are sincere and heartfelt. They create what is ingeniously called diabolical suspicion" by Mr. Baldwin, the late Prime Minister of England. The suspicion is natural and rational, and it is reasonable to expect that western civilization will yet live for sometime, though not for ever. When camouflage and suspicion, force and fraud are given up as unworthy of human nature, western civilization will enter upon a new era for good or evil, but will cease to be western civilization, to have its ideals and purposes, its methods and principles of thought and action.

Among the devastations made by the great war, the predominance of the fear of losing what has been gained, over the desire to gain more; the desire to placate the exploitable, to fatten the lamb without the purpose of enjoying the mutton and wool, to invest capital without any wish for profits, to preserve the weak without any wish to use the workers on starvation wages, are of the most tremendous consequence to western civilization and unless these changes prove to be evanescent, the latter must be prepared for what has happened to eastern civilization which has a glorious past behind it and an equally inglorious future before it. The Aryans were at one time very much like what the nordics are at the present day. They exterminated the obstinate races, enslaved the docile ones, exploited with both hands, plundered and produced superfluously, and enjoyed luxuriously. But the day of evil came in due time, with the thought of spirituality and morality, of monism and dualism, with atoms and atmons, of *Purush* and *Prakriti*, of pantheism and atheism, of renunciation and negation, with the dreadful dual ideas of appearance and reality.

The cosmic nature of man was drastically transformed into the ethical process of life. Love supplanted hate, charity ruled out hostility, sympathy replaced natural antipathy, renunciation had preference over attachment, the ultimate ideal of life was exiled from this world to the other world ; spirituality and submission to the will of God replaced the idea of independence and self-sufficiency, confidence and credulity replaced circumspection and circumvention, objective reality evaporated into subjective appearance, and the whole universe was turned topsy-turvy with the affirmation of life driven into the sea of negation.The change was premature. Ancient Indian civilization ought to have waited until the entire world had become civilized, so that there might be no barbarians left to confound it like Alexander, or Mahmud of Ghazni, Muhammad of Ghore or Babar of Samurkand.

But in any case death is inevitable to life. Life presupposes death or non-animation, and death presupposes life or animation. Western civilization is no exception to this eternal truth. If it has waited long enough to destroy external barbarism it has not waited to destroy internal barbarism, and it has rather strengthened its forces by its own progress. The truth is that western civilization has so far been engaged in conquests, and has had no time to consolidate its empire. Of the two essentials of civilization, competition and co-operation, the first aims at conquest and the second at consolidation. Western civilization in the intoxication of its success in conquest, has neglected the problem of consolidation. Conquest impiles disorder ; consolidation implies order. Western civilization has so far passed its life in disorder. The question of order has seldom struck it : I mean true order, order of the inward type, or psychological order. The order which has so far kept it going is all external. The masses have been kept under control either by the fear of an alien god, I mean the Christian god, or by the fear of laws, that is, legislative enactments. Their psychology which has so far been exploited for conquest, now refuses to submit to order and peace. It has been trained in a wild warlike atmosphere, and it cannot adjust itself now to the restraints of tranquility. It wants employment on old lines,—employment in adventure and conquest. Peace and social consolidation are repugnant to its temperament.

The co-operation which undoubtedly exists in the west is a slave of competition, not its regulative principle. Co-operation

has been stimulated by the hope of conquest, not by the prospect of peace. At the instigation of the rich the poor have cheerfully run to the front or to the factory,—all factories in the western countries are munition factories,—the illusion of nationalism stirred them from within. But nationalism in peace is a moribund thing. Nationalism with reduced armies and navies, treacherous treaties and empty treasuries, best finds scope for its energy and taste and temperament in communal warfare.

Exploitation presupposes physical or intellectual superiority in the exploiter. It also implies a lower morality in him, if we regard the ethical process of life to be superior to the cosmic process, but not otherwise. In the climacteric stage of civilization the ethical process is undeniably superior to the cosmic process of life. In the intermediate stages judgment on the qualities of a civilization must be circumstantial. For every stage of civilization there is a particular mixture of the two forms of life which advances and protects it best, and is pragmatically most valuable, and therefore most moral. Western civilization has a higher morality at the present day because the mixture of cosmicality and ethicality which guides it is more advantageous than the mixture which obtains in the east. In the climacteric stage there will be no competition and no exploitation. The struggle for existence will cease, and natural selection will have no scope for its activity. All men will be equal physically, intellectually and morally. There will be no ascendancy or dependence ; no desire to excel or exploit. The difficulty lies in the fact that the ultimate stage of civilization is not approached by any knowable gradual process of replacing the cosmic by the ethical life, for progress depends upon environment, and environment though modifiable cannot be wholly eliminated or drastically changed. The power of executing a plan of life and attaining progress in civilization depends largely upon intellectual vigour, massiveness and sharpness. They help the cosmic process of life more than the ethical process, though they are commingled with both processes of life. Intellectuality so far as it shows itself in social behaviour is generally connected with crime by the link of cleverness. It is connected with charity by the link of wisdom. Crime without cleverness, and charity without wisdom, both lead to failure and ruin. Civilization advances by crime and charity, and its measure of progress is determined by the degree of cleverness mixed with

crime, and of wisdom mixed with charity. Cleverness means the power of circumvention, and wisdom means foresight. The two are almost inextricably associated. However, experience shows that cleverness is more prominent than wisdom in western civilization. The desire of progress, conquest and new achievement, is stronger than the desire of order, consolidation and continuity of possession and peaceful enjoyment. In terms of evolution, differentiation is greater than integration in western civilization.

Exploitation between equally civilized countries takes the form of war *in posse.* Commerce between two such nations takes the form of fair barter or exchange ; and attempt at exploitation on the part of either speedily encounters circumventive movements on the part of the other. Such exploitation is regarded as aggression, and circumvention soon exceeding the limits of pure defence passes into aggression, making war possible. Thus Western civilization based upon self-interest is peaceless. It is war *in posse*, if not war *in actu.* It is a fight of Greek against Greek at present, because old barbarians are all defeated, conquered, subdued, and new barbarians have not yet appeared in full force.

The greatest among the civilized countries are all empires, or aspire to imperial status. Empire means free exploitation of the so-called semi-civilized countries. Land hunger has been largely replaced by profit hunger, because there is no more land immediately available for direct predation and extirpation. All such lands have been parcelled out within the last three hundred years. The right of profiteering or profit-making, though a subtle, changeful right, is claimed as a settled right. The dispute between vested interest and natural right, which had its origin in revolutionary social movements, has now passed into the pugnacity of imperialism, with the result that the open door in exploitable countries is now a congested door for all imperial nations. China laid her door open to all imperial nations, but the door is now overcrowded, because it is too small for the fatty limbs of the visitors, who all want to have front seats at the imperialistic dramatic show in the hall and to take prominent part in the performance.

Barbarism is an essential condition of progressive civilization. The struggle for existence is replaced by struggle for progress when existence has been more or less ensured ; and the struggle for progress soon assumes the form of the struggle for ascendancy and suzerainty.

The struggle becomes complicated by the fact that extermination is apt to be mutual, and the extirpation of one of the belligerents weakens the organism of civilization as a whole. At the same time rivals must be subdued. A correct balancing between cosmicity and ethicality is required, and it is here that western civilization finds itself inadequate, more indequate than all previous civilizations. This inadequacy is made conspicuous by the fact that in ancient civilizations there never were more than two rivals for ascendancy. At the present day there are several rivals,—more than five or six of them, and they are all at sixes and sevens. They all want to preserve civilization while each wants to be suzerain. The conflict between civilization and suzerainty is the outstanding fact in western civilization at the present day. It may be suspected that when the worse comes to the worst civilization will be abandoned for the sake of imperialism. To realize the ultimate situation one need only take account of the state of affairs and the psychology of the great powers on the eve of the great war, which has momentarily frightened them out of their normal mentality.

North America was exterminated because the people were a hindrance to progress of civilization. They were offered a part to play in the civilization of the country. They disdained to play that part, as too mean for them. If it were possible to curb their pride, they might be permitted to live on. But that was found impossible or remote, while western civilization was crying for quick progress. So the cheaper method of extermination was adopted, and the business once begun was vigorously continued as a national profession, while the possibility of importing a more docile race of man was radiantly looming from Africa. Western civilization subsequently showed its racial impartiality when for purposes of economy it enslaved the civilized masses, and emancipated savage negroes. It was possible to conceive a state of society all over the civilized countries in which all whitemen would live as gentlemen, while Negroes served them as menials and factory workers. But that would have been less economical, and western civilization cleverly escaped retardations and possible entanglements by introducing white labour into the factories. It felt no moral scruples because its instinct was cosmically correct. It was eminently a time for progress of civilization. Steam and engineering had placed at its disposal stupendous forces of production, which could be

adequately utilized only by predation. It was no time to think of the condition of the masses. When civilization was firmly established with the help of these forces, there would be plenty of time and opportunity to improve the condition of the masses. It would be unwise to sacrifice the actual and the immediately attainable to the potential and remotely achievable.

Reason and instinct supported each other, and western civilization boldly launched upon the programme of exploitation which has carried it to its present condition of colossal wealth and gigantic poverty in mixture. The worst of it is that calculation shows that if the entire wealth, thus gained and accumulated, were divided among the people the poor would not be much better off than they were when the mechanical revolution was fairly started on its titanic career. Expectations have been belied. The potentiality has proved a mirage. The masses are still poor, and hopelessly so, while wealth is accumulating with redoubled force. Western civilization is bewildered, and opinion is violently divided. Some think that this is the true nature of civilization, that is, industrial civilization, which is synonymous with western civilization. Others think that this is not ideal civilization, but the methods and remedies so far proposed to improve it are worse than the disease. Others still think that socialism will cure the disease, that without hampering production it would bring about a fair and civilized mode of distribution, and make all men happy and free, which is the true object of civilization. The second school acknowledges its impotence, mixed with insincerity. It assumes an air of superior knowledge to the point of impudence. If it really possesses superior knowledge, it is at heart callous, if not positively barbarous. It suggested partial remedies with diffidence and reluctance. The first school includes the typically civilized philosophers of western civilization. They think that the condition of the poor ought to be made worse by hardening the struggle for existence, and making their lives more difficult to bear, for otherwise civilization will take a backward turn. It has elevated itself by making the poor poorer, for that is the meaning of hardening the struggle. Benjamin Kidd is the exponent of this theory of civilization. He is a Christian Darwinian, an ultra-rationalistic rationalist. He has truly understood the inner nature of western civilization. He speaks of the extermination of savage life as a moral achievement, though,

following conventional politeness, he speaks in a subdued tone. But the entire drift of social evolution is towards what I have ascribed to him.

Even philosophers of profound learning and sincerity are in a state of suspended judgment about the situation created by eastern civilization. Eucken writes; If in this blind medley of conflicting forces there be anything at all left for us to do, it can only be to make the struggle for existence as hard, persistent and ruthless as we can, so that all the unfit may be weeded out and the process of selection made as speedy as possible This is exactly what Benjamin Kidd suggests as the substance of a pretty large volume, which, judging by the vast circulation it has attained throughout the civilized world, differentiated by a plurality of languages, has been appreciated by the majority of the civilized peoples.

Though it is an essential condition of the growth of civilization, barbarism is in the long run destructive of its stability. History has no experience of either perfect barbarism or perfect civilization. We arbitrarily call one race savage, and another civilized. Every civilization is a mixture of barbarity and civility. Tool-making is one of the elements of civilization. It is not its whole structure. It helps the creation or acquisition of wealth, a necessary limb of civilization. Wealth may be created or acquired by predation or production. Predation is a sign of barbarism. Refined predation, that is exploitation, is refined barbarism, sometimes invisible barbarism.

Western civilization mistakes progress towards invisible barbarism for the true progress of civilization, and unconsciously makes for rebarbarisation. Invisible, unavowed, almost unconscious barbarism makes civilization unstable. Invisible barbarism is the agent of civilized self-interest, which is one of the guiding principles of all civilizations, and the supreme driving force of western civilization. Lord Balfour discerned this secret, and regretted that in many civilized hearts self-interest was not quite so strong as the requirements of western civilization demanded (Foundations of Belief). But self-interest is necessarily a meddlesome, quarrelsome thing ; and when two self-interests,—individual, communal or international, encounter each other, the interest of civilization is jeopardised. Such an encounter has recently taken place in the shape of the great war, and western civilization will continue to feel its

debilitating influence for sometime yet to come. Another great war may lay her delapidated finally or for centuries. It is high time western civilization entered into a life insurance transaction somewhere ; but so long as it suffers from the malady of self-interest and continues the exploitation habit to revive its nerves, no socio-medical philosopher will certify its life as acceptable for insurance. This habit like its sister, known as the alcohol habit, is good for youth in moderate doses. It is pernicious in advanced age, when the system is built up, and further growth means pathological plethora. Fasting is better than feasting in old age. Judged by ancient standards western civilization has not lived long, but it has lived a rapid life.

Barbarism is the negation of civilization. Yet it is necessary for its growth. The paradox has been solved since the middle of of the nineteenth century in a novel way. Barbarism is judged by its purpose. It is divided between savage barbarism and civilized barbarism. Barbarism practised for its own sake or for the immediate pleasure which it brings to the perpetrator or spectator is savage barbarism. The massacre of weak races is civilized barbarism. The contribution of North America to civilization would have been impossible without such massacre. Civilization itself would have been impossible if the savage races were not exterminated from the world. Was it brutal or barbarous to exterminate the carnivora ? Certainly it was not. If these were not exterminated they might have exterminated the human race, and there would have been no civilization. Hence it follows that whatever stands in the way of civilization may be fairly, justly and morally exterminated ; and if the weaker races stand out as a hindrance to civilization their extermination is justified by divine law,—the law which after long ages of progress in civilization has been rediscovered by Darwin.

DARWIN AND CIVILIZATION.

Civilization is a prolongation of biological evolution, and all principles of energy and action which apply to the latter apply

to the former also. Circumstantial selection must follow the lines of natural selection. It would be criminal to differentiate them. God has given us intelligence and freedom to be used in the way in which He Himself uses them. It would be rebellion against His authority and His ideals to use them in a different way. This is the inner psychology of western civilization. It may be objected that the God here referred to is different from the God congregationally worshipped by the civilized peoples. It is the Darwin-God. But the truth is that this God has existed in the civilized mind from the beginning. Darwin did not create Him, but only discovered Him and brought Him to light. He stirred up in the civilized man what already existed in the subconscious region, in a secretive form, of his mind, shy and shame-faced, afraid to come out into the light for fear of derision and extravagances of scoffing and stoning. Darwin's great merit lies in the fact that he discovered his god at the proper moment, when the mind of the civilized man was prepared for His reception, by the expulsion from it of all repulsive prejudices and pre-occupations by philosophers like Mill and Comte, Huxley and Spencer, who were the true baptists in the drama of the new regeneration. Christ took three laborious centuries to advertise himself, because the world was unprepared for his reception, and even then he was received in a half hearted manner in a small corner of the world. Darwin has converted the entire world in half a century. Christ left twelve apostles. Darwin has left twelve million. Even the heathens of the east welcome him, though they ought to know that the ultimate purpose and meaning of his mission is to exploit them, expropriate them, and enslave or exterminate them. They seek the light to die in its heat.

PARADOX OF CIVILIZATION

Civilization is commonly the result of purification of barbarism. Western civilization is the outcome of the perfection of it. The forces of civilization are clearly exploited in this process of perfection. Education is one of them. General education is imperfect without military education in western civilization. Military education is compulsory and universal. Where such education does not exist competitive games are introduced to give tone to the youth.

Love and co-operation are ancillary to conflict and competition. Western civilization never sleeps a dreamless sleep, and its dreams all relate to foreign predation or exploitation. When such exploitation is not available it directs its energies to exploitation at home. Labour and women are taken in hand. Reduction of wages, increased hours of work and other advantages are sought to destroy the industries of neighbouring nations. Women are sought to be kept under control by not allowing them to practise professions for which they are qualified, and they are driven in droves into factories and mines, and compelled to produce and reproduce for national benefit.

ITS RELATION TO BARBARISM.

Indeed civilization and barbarism are co-operating in a competitive race, to drive each other into perfection. Civilization increases with advanced barbarism, and barbarism increases with advancing civilization. Both are approaching towards perfection. Civilization advances the exploitation of external nature. Barbarism advances the exploitation of neighbour. Civilization is reinforced by barbarism, and barbarism is reinforced by civilization in these two types of exploitation. They look like sisters. But the time will come when they will begin to quarrel, and knock each other down.

Barbarism increases with the progress of this civilization, and population increases faster than either. Civilization is bewildered. Even barbarism is bewildered. Nature has very little more to yield to exploitation ; and exploitable neighbours are crying for employment. This is the paradox which calls obstreperously for solution all over the world, affected by western civilization.

"THE YOUNG BARBARIAN."

Crime increases with the progress of this civilization. Between the police and the criminal the former finds it hard to grapple with the latter. The situation may be easily imagined when the criminal

will definitely outrun, and successfully circumvent the police. He is already doing so at many places with increasing efficiency. The criminal builds his home at the very centre of civilization London, New York, Paris and Berlin are the citadels of barbarism as well as of civilization. Both have concentrated their forces in these glorious places, where wealth and poverty, learning and ignorance, beauty and ugliness, panarchy and anarchy, amusements and screams, music and noise, charity and cruelty are all mixed up in perfection. Civilization and barbarism seem to be vying with each other to shine most. "The young barbarians all at play" is a condensed morsel of wholesome truth made toothsome by the flavour of humour. But who can expect young barbarians growing into exclusively civilized manhood? Civilized gentlemen have barbarism latent in their blood. The potential becomes actual when occasion is ripe. The tiger cub grows into the royal tiger, and the royal tiger becomes a maneater, when living in the neighbourhood of human habitations. Civilized barbarism is rampant, but barbarous barabarism is not absent. It is now extensively practised in Africa, where the experiments of America are in a mollified form re-enacting themselves for civilizing that dark continent. The difference, if any, is due to the fact that there is not a second Africa now in existence to supply the place of the recalcitrant aborigines. Enslavement is preferred because extermination is ruinous. The negroes are civilized against their will, and made to work for the benefit of their white Sambos and Quimbos. For some places India was turned into a recruiting ground for labour, on a system, undoubtedly more gentle than the one by which Africa was made to contribute to the civilization of America, but with no better ulterior purpose. The system has failed for obvious reasons, among which may be counted the fact that barbarism is not sufficiently refined and subtle to meet the requirements of the case, crude barbarism being out of the question.

ANIMAL AND SUPER ANIMAL LIFE.

Civilization creates superanimal life out of the animal life of man. Western civilization is no exception to this rule. It has created a superanimal life in many respects superior to what other civilizations have done. It is true animal life is very strong in the

western countries. But that does not prove that the superanimal life is weak. The truth is both lives are stronger in the west than in the east. What makes western civilization ugly to the eastern mind is that its superanimal life is subservient to the animal life. The eastern mind is accustomed to think that the total life, including animal and superanimal life must be equal all over the world ; from which it follows that where the animal life is strong the superanimal life must be weak. This idea is strengthened by the fact that the spiritual life, whichis a branch of the superanimal life, is very weak in the west. Western civilization has had a hard struggle against a special form of spiritual life for its very existence. The persecutions of that life are still green in the memory of western civilization, and it is determined to keep it down as far as possible. It allows that form of spiritual life to live for its own peculiar purpose; it helps exploitation. Columbus was enabled to start the era of exploitation in unknown countries because the Pope allowed him, and the Pope allowed him because he believed that exploration would expand christanity. The missionary accompanies the explorer, the exploiter, the expropriator, the exterminator. He sometimes precedes him. Christianity keeps labour and women under control. Christanity checks anti-social agitation and anarchism. Christanity supports the empire of property and masculinity. Therefore with all its past misdemeanour, Christianity has been allowed to live in the west to live, albeit, a life of growing subordination and humiliation. It will disappear one day, but in the meanwhile, it has served to lower itself by its senile longevity, and to create a general distaste for spiritual life of any kind.

WESTERN CIVILIZATION AND WAR.

The most ominous fact in the present condition of western civilization is the growing war-weariness, the growing desire for peace, which, weak at present, is showing clearly discernible signs of development and expansion. Western civilization has been built by war ; it has been developed by war ; it has been raised to its present condition by war. It will decay with the decay of war, and vanish with its vanishment.

The men in the foretime were hunting men ; and to hunt a neighbouring tribe, kill the males, loot the village and possess the females, was the most profitable as well as the most excitable way of living. The men were like children fond of excitement and play. Profit in the shape of growing civilization came as a by-product. Fighting developed their physical strength. The desire for victory developed their mental vigour. The law of natural selection had adequate play. The weaker men were weeded out. No doubt the resulting tribe included a number of women of the defeated tribe, but there is nothing to suggest that their eugenic qualities were inferior to those of the women of the conquering tribe. The vanquished males were not all killed, but many of them were taken as slaves, and slavery was necessary for productive purposes. We may also suppose that the children of the women, brought from the conquered tribe, formed a class between the masters and the slaves. Thus social classes were formed. Social heterogeneity led to division of labour, and increased the productive power of the society as well as its predatory efficiency and sustaining capacity. Civilization is a waste product, in all cases of human advancement by war, murder, torture and plunder. Western civilization is pre-eminently a waste-product of this kind. Progress came without forethought, prevision and purpose. The best among the early men, possessed of surplus energy and sound animal instincts, detested the waste product very much in the same way that industrial machinery was detested by craftsmen in the Eighteenth Century. Its restraints were deeply felt as a disadvantage ; and the benefits showing themselves gradually, took a long time to convince men that civilization was a good thing for men.

Among the benefits of civilization, one of the highest value was the advancement of knowledge,—knowledge of the comparative capacity of the remote neighbours for production, and for resistance to force. In the early days the aggressors were not always the conquerors. But with the progress of civilization they began to make calculations, and war which was a matter of daily occurrence became intermittent. The warrior learnt to discriminate between one neighbour and another for purposes of aggression. War with a powerful neighbour was more hazardous, but victory was more glorious. Weak neighbours who were conscious of their weakness kept aloof and seldom gave offence. The strong detested fighting

a decidedly weak neighbour and nobility of feeling was cultivated by him, with the result that the weak neighbour learnt submissiveness. The latter was however not spared when necessity demanded his spoliation. Defensiveness on his part was resented as an affront, and he was crushed. This was part of the morals of nobility, and war became a complex factor in the building up of an ethical code, which has lasted down to the present day with but slight modifications. The influence of the unseen world deserves acknowledgement, but it has never substantially affected the tone and temper of this code. Social economy has modified the code to some extent at the cost of its dignity and masterfulness. It has made morality somewhat sneaky. The original instincts of man have, however, not wholly lost their vigour, and they assert themselves against calculating meanness, dignified as foresight, whenever occasion demands. The early man, however, never expressed regret, while civilized man has learnt to repent whenever he is defeated or frustrated.

Among all the civilizations of the world western civilization has least deviated from the primal moral code. Yet Nietzsche regrets deviation wherever they have happened, and characterises the civilization as a corruption induced by Christian influences. He regards Christ as the greatest impostor who has turned the character of man into an ineffable abomination. The school founded by him wants to restore social morality to its pristine dignity and nobility, to the master-morality and slave mentality which characterised those whose activities laid the foundation of civilization by an unconscious process based upon natural instincts, as little influenced by intelligence, reason and forethought as possible. He regrets that the original human nature has been debased and debauched by civilization into a second nature, by no means calculated to raise the dignity and value of man.

This school of thought has received reinforcements from unexpected quarters. Darwin's theory of biological evolution by natural selection, assisted by the struggle for existence lends great support to the Nietzschean theory of morality. Darwin's followers are divided in their opinion as to the continuity of the process of biological evolution in the progress of civilization. Some of them, like Benjamin Kidd, find that western civilization has been advancing with acclerated pace by the hardening of the struggle for existence

which facilitated natural selection. Spencer is vague and self-contradictory. He attributes the progress of civilization to natural selection, but finds that at the ultimate end natural selection will cease to operate. Huxley considers that natural selection has been steadily declining in proportion to the progress of civilization. He finds that civilization is antagonistic to evolution by natural selection. The selection of civilization is artificial and ethical. Natural selection is natural and cosmical. The opposition of natural selection to the progress of civilization gradually declines in vigour and extension, and will ultimately disappear with the perfection of the latter.

Western civilization having struggled with christian civilization for a thousand years, and having in the end thrown it overboard as a monstrous hindrance to its progress, began a vigorous life in its youth at the close of the medieval age. Columbus and other master mariners had cleared the road for its march towards perfection. The world which was getting too small for it was suddenly expanded from mediterranean to Atlantic dimension. The discovery of vast continents with gold and silver in their bowels, and wheat and cotton on their breasts made them worth exploiting. The beauty of the thing lay in the fact that the occupants of these continents were weak and ignorant, utterly unable to defend themselves and their possessions, actual and potential, against half civilised men, or what is the same thing against civilization in its youth. The history of the exploitation that followed is too well-known to require re-counting. Western civilization had during a thousand years of christian domination learnt the value of meanness without forgetting the value of nobility. Streams of emigrants waged war against the natives, using explosives against elementary iron, defeating them, torturing them, and eventually exterminating them. They took possession of their gold, their crops, their hunting fields, and all that they owned actually or potentially. They did this in the name of western civilization, and the result is conspicuously visible in the cities, wall streets, transcontinental railways, colossal trusts and magnificence of all kinds and varieties. The Nordics in the early ages would have loathed the war against the weak and helpless, but they had been corrupted by christian civilization, and they now valued sneaky happiness and external grandeur and splendour more than they valued the dignity and nobility of character, which animated their barbaric ancestors of pre-christian times, and which

help stir the pride of race in the white man's heart down to the present day.

But the war overseas was not altogether devoid of the qualities which the uncorrupted nordic would consider it honourable to display. There was rivalry among the exploiters, and these fought among themselves for the evolution of western civilization. In the long run white men, who had been least touched by Christian civilization secured the prize.

Spain was the pioneer in the exploitation as well as the exploration of the New World. She had been most corrupted by christian influence, and morally weakened by Islamic domination. She did not retain ascendancy long. France never made a hearty endeavour to win the New World. Holland was too small to manage a world-wide empire. Her population was insignificant and when war raged in all parts of the vast empire, she found her resources in man-power inadequate. Germany was too busy, fighting with catholic corruption, and too disorganized by internal troubles to think of extending imperial rule into the New World. The result was that England, comparatively remote from Rome, and with the advantage of insularity, first shook off the yoke of christian domination, and took almost exclusive possession of the world, which the Pope, in the name of God, had presented as a divine gift to Spain. The Englishman takes the greatest pride in calling himself a nordic, least touched by christian corruption, and therefore furthest advanced in western civilization. He rules the New World now, as a matter of nordic justice and barbaric right.

It is true the ascendancy of western civilization has now indubitably passed to the United States of America. But the American is an Englishman by blood, a real nordic, not a red Indian or an Italian, an Irishman or a Frenchman. Amidst all the meanness of exploitation among weak races, the English immigrant, the backward man had the opportunity of cultivating his primal nordic character, in clearing the jungles of the hinter land and making it habitable for civilized men. He afterwards took advantage of the service of slaves, practising inhuman tortures, and even creating slaves out of his own blood, but he is a true Englishman, who combines the advantages of the Nietzschean morality with the cream of the intelligence of advanced western civilization.

Western civilization aims at the evolution of life by the destruction of life. This may sound shocking to eastern ears, but it conveys a truth of profound significance. The individual has an ephemeral life. The nation has a greater stability ; but humanity is immortal to all intents and purposes. The individual is sacrificed for the benefit of the nation. The nation is sacrificed for the benefit of humanity. This is the law of the evolution of the life of humanity. Civilization is a prolongation of the biological evolution. Biological evolution limited to sub-human life relates to the evolution of bones and tissues, their form and colour, their texture and toughness. The nervous system is all but left out. Evidence of evolution is gathered from physiological facts. Psychological research is difficult and limited in scope. Animals do not live in society and opportunities for examining their mental universe are rare. One dog may be different from another in length, height, form and strength. One variety of dog may be similarly different from another. But their mentality is vary much alike. In man differences can be examined more widely and accurately, between one individual and another, between one variety and another. Differences arise from heredity and environment. Society and social conventions form ninety nine per cent of the environment in the case of man. Society readily yields itself to research. Hence the evolution of human life in its psychological aspects, is more active and can be more accurately studied. This evolution of human life appears under the name of civilization. But the mind of man is a very complex structure, and its evolutions (including its degenerations) are so quick and subtle and changeful that some philosophers are unwilling to regard civilization as synonymous with biological evolution or as a prolongation of it. The real question at issue is whether psychological evolution is brought about by the same forces as what is ordinarily known as biological evolution. Does this evolution proceed by natural selection, effected by the struggle for existence, through the instrumentality of survival ?

The problem is complicated by the commingling of Nature and Art. The human mind is the seat of art, the ovary in which the egg of art is formed and developed. Environment or external forces stir it, and place it in the creative mood. The mind of the civilized man differs from that of the savage so enormously that it looks more like a work of art than a creation of nature. Broadly

speaking, purposive processes performed by man are artificial, and instinctive processes are natural. But reason and instinct are inextricably entangled, while the entanglement increases with advancing civilization. Thus it is difficult to say what part of mental evolution is due to natural selection and what to artificial selection. Artificial selection is sometimes designated as ethical selection, but the term seems misleading, as the artificial selection may be both moral and immoral, as common sense understands the word. Selection implies survival in the struggle for existence ; but the survival value of a mentality in the existing condition of human life, is derived more from immoral than from moral sources. Survival value is determined by self-preservation. Moral value is determined by self-sacrifice, undergone for the purpose of preserving others. Supermoral activities are those which tend to preserve both self and others, that is, entire humanity. Super-moral activity is rare, if not a matter of pious hope. What is mistaken for supermoral activity is really inspired by prudence in which the interests of the self absorb nine parts out of ten of the motive. It is the prudence of the man who sees the folly of killing the hen that lays the golden egg. It has no reverence for chicken-life. Immoral activities are the response to the stimulus by which the non-moral activities of nature awakens man out of his peaceful slumber. The love of life and the loathing of labour lead man along devious paths to the heights of civilization.

Struggle implies the existence of hostile forces ; and if man struggles for existence he struggles against enemies that threaten to put an end to it. What are these enemies ? Broadly speaking, these enemies are Nature and Neighbour. Nature includes animate as well as inanimate enemies. Animals and animalculæ, quadrupeds, bipeds, insects and invisible microbes, would have extinguished the human race long ago if man did not struggle against them, did not fight them with brain and brawn, with iron and explosives. The visible enemies, called brutes, to give them a bad name, have been nearly exterminated. The lion, the grizzly, the tiger, the ape, the bear and all other ferocious animals have nearly disappeared by the activities of man. God had given him dominion over them, but they refused to submit to his domination, and so he had nothing left for it, but to slay them with his muscles, and his cunning, his tantalizing ethicality and tool making intelligence. Other animals submitted to slavery and became domesticated. They worked

for him, ploughed his fields drew his wheeled things, carried his luggage, supplied him with milk, submitted to his knife to give him meat for his maw, wool for his skin, and skin to cover his feet. At present the struggle for existence is carried on chiefly against invisible enemies, the microbes, whose existence was unsuspected until recently, when man was astounded to discover that he was surrounded by interminable enemies, who could not be exterminated in the way in which lions, tigers and wolves were exterminated, because of their supernatural fertility, which can fill a whole continent with living beings in a twinkling of the eye. Whatever may be said about the morality of extirpating the other tribes on the frontier of man, it seems to me that the war against red ants, white ants, cockroaches, fleas, maggots, mice and mosquitoes, is not open to criticism as a deviation from the path of virtue. Of course, opinion differs regarding the slaying of domestic animals. The distinction between economic morality and spiritual morality is permissible.

It is not necessary to dilate on the war with inanimate nature. This consists of gravity, heat, electricity and chemical force, directly or indirectly acting upon man, but chiefly indirectly. Man has to struggle against the barrenness of the soil, the excessive heat and cold of the atmosphere, as well as excessive humidity or aridity. Much of man's suffering which was formerly supposed to be due to the opposition of the inanimate forces has now been traced to the hostility of minute living forces. Science is the weapon with which civilized man has in the past waged, and is now waging, war against these enemies with increasing success. Heat and electricity have been defeated, conquered, enslaved, put in fetters, and trained to serve man in various ways. Microbes of all kinds are coming under control. They no longer harass or embarrass man in the same way as they used to do before. They no longer send men to pray in church and temple while thousands die by their touch at home. Man has learnt to fight them and massacre them without any moral stigma, without calling down upon himself any divine ordinance or curse or other intimidations. On the contrary God has been made to feel that He has reason to be ashamed to reflect that He ever created these invisible creatures to destroy the supreme product of his creative energy. They were not created during the first six days described in the book of Genesis. They were probably created after man was expelled from paradise but there is no mention of the fact

anywhere in the Bible, or in any other book dealing with divine charity or malignity.

The war against neighbour stands upon a different footing in the moral valuation of man. It has existed in spite of religion, and inspite of phiosophy, and inspite of social ethics, and inspite of the Golden Rule, since the days of the caveman, in accordance with the evolutionary philosophy of modern science, and simply because it has had survival value. Dr. Millikan thinks that war will disappear when and only when, the conditions which have given it survival value have disappeared, and he further thinks that "those conditions are disappearing now, primarily because of the changes in the world situation being brought about by the growth of modern science, in which lies the only hope this world has of maintaining in the future a suitable balance between population and food supply."

This opinion is open to criticism on the ground that it contradicts the Malthusian law of the growth of population and subsistence. Dr. Millikan evidently means by balance' a constant balance ; and a constant balance is impossible between the variations of two things one of which grows geometrically and the other arithmetically. Science may bring about a sudden increase of food supply, and for the time being make life comfortable. But in a short time population reaches a point where the increased supply falls short of the requirement.

But the vital objection to the opinion lies in the fact that the suitable balance mentioned by Dr. Millikan will lead western civilization to the swamp of stagnation, and ultimately into the slough of decadence. The survival value of war determines selection, and selection determines progress of civilization or of evolution. Where there is no war, there is no survival value, no selection, no progress of civilization. The cessation of war may add to the value of life, that is, it may make life more comfortable, more happy and more worth living, but it will stop the progress of civilization, and change the ultimate purpose and ideal of life. The purpose of western civilization is often supposed to be the attainment of happiness that is, of stable happiness. This is evidently an error. Its purpose, if it has a deliberately formed purpose, is to make life complete, social life as well as individual life, and social life cannot be complete until the world is filled with the maximum population capable of

subsisting upon the maximum supply of food and comfort on the highest standard of living. There is no question of happiness or misery. It is a question of activism, productive and reproductive. Contentment is not the ideal of western civilization. It creates discontent in order to keep up its activity. The discontent is sometimes called divine discontent. But the deity is inseparable from the devil ; and it is commonly believed that while the deity helps the foremost the devil takes the hindmost. The object of western civilization is to reserve the few for the deity, and relegate the many to the devil. The few and the many have so far been primarily represented in terms of race, so that many races have disappeared from the face of the earth by the progress of western civilization. The dispute between the few and the many have now added a com munal aspect in order to keep up the vigour of western civlization. The wars between the rich and the poor, between man and woman are new creations to fill up the gaps left by the elimination of numerous inferior races.

The civilized life is a life of war. To escape from war is to abandon western civilization. The cry against war is a disquieting phenomenon for all lovers of that civilization. There must be war whether violent or non-violent. Even Gandhi cannot give up the idea of war. Though preaching physical non-violence, he is a past master of mental torture. Co-operative non-co-operation is his instrument, and imperialists are rightly afraid of him more than they would be afraid of guns and explosives in the possession of the revolutionists. War is moral, and James was wrong when he covertly stigmatised it as immoral, in the essay which he wrote on "the moral equivalent of war". A perusal of the essay, however, shows that he was somewhat sceptical on the question whether war is moral or immoral, while he leant to the opinion that it was uneconomic. He thinks that on this subject "the civilized man has developed a double personality, and civilized opinion is a curious mental mixture". "The military instincts and ideals are as strong as ever, but are confronted by reflective criticisms which surely curb their ancient freedom. Pure loot and mastery seem no longer avowable motives, and pretexts must be found for attributing them solely to the enemy". "Peace in militarist mouths to-day is a synonym for war expected. Every up-to-date dictionary should say that peace and war mean the same thing, now in posse now in actu".

"'The intensely sharp preparation for war is the real war, permanent, increasing; and the battles are only a sort of public verification of the mastery gained during the peace interval". "Our ancestors have bred pugnacity into our bone and marrow, and thousands of years of peace wont breed it out of us". "The popular imagination fairly fattens on the thought of war". "Patriotism no one thinks discreditable; nor does any one deny that war is the romance of history". "The notion of a sheep's paradise revolts our higher imagination". "If war had ever stopped we should have to re-invent it to redeem life from flat degeneration". "Quite apart from any question of profit war is an absolute good, say some, for it is human nature at its highest dynamic. Its horrors are a cheap price to pay for rescue from the only alternative supposed, of a world of clerks and teachers, of co-education and zoophity, of industrialism unlimited, and feminism unabashed". "When the time of development is ripe war must come, say some, reason or no reason, for the justifications pleaded are invariably fictitous. War is in short a permanent human obligation." "War" says Steinmetz, "is an ordeal instituted by god, who weighs the nations in its balance." "It is the essential form of the state, and the only function in which people can employ all their powers at once and convergently. No victory is possible save as the resultant of a totality of virtues, no defeat for which some vice or weakness is not responsible. Fidelity, cohesiveness, tenacity, heroism, conscience, education, inventiveness economy, wealth, physical health and vigour—there is not a moral or an intellectual point of superiority that does not tell, when God holds his assizes and hurls the people upon one another". Simon Pattin said, "Mankind was nursed in pain and fear, and the transition to a pleasure economy may be fatal to a being wielding no powers of defense against its disintegrative influences".

Having admitted by copious quotations from writers on war that it develops the manly virtues and having found by experience that modern man inherits all the innate pugnacity and all the love of glory of his ancestors, and that discussions of war's irrationality and horrors are of no effect upon him, (for he believes that horrors make the fascination) and that war is the strong life; it is the life in extremes; and that war taxes are the only ones men never hesitate to pay, James suddenly turns *volte face*, and with masterful inconsequence adds, "I will now

confess my own utopia. I devoutly believe in the reign of peace and in the gradual advent of some sort of a socialistic equilibrium. The fatalistic view of war functions is to me nonsense for I know that war making is due to definite motives and subject to prudential checks and reasonable criticisms, just like any other form of enterprise. And when whole nations are the armies, and the science of destruction vies in intellectual refinement with the science of production, I see that war becomes absurd and impossible from its own monstrosity. Extravagant, ambitious wills have to be replaced by reasonable claims, and nations must make common cause against them". He admits again "the war party is assuredly right in affirming and re-affirming that the martial virtues, although originally gained through war, are absolute and permanent human goods".

Eventually James comes to the conclusion that the martial virtues, if applied to war against nature, will prove to be more economic than in their present activities applied to war against neighbour. He forgets for the moment that the war against *Nature* is already in existence in full vigour and the industrial world suffers more from over-production than from inability to meet consumer's demand. National conscription for the war against nature will lead to moral degeneration and communal war, which is more uneconomical and disastrous than foreign war. But what right has a writer who speaks of natural selection of tribes determined by war to speak in the name of economy ? The most uneconomical process by which progress is secured is the one by which nature, one might say, God, secures it, *viz*., the process of selection determined by the survival of the fittest in the struggle for existence. The method is characterised as "trial and error". Thousands of lives are rejected for the selection of a single life.

War against non-moral forces has no value for the pugnacity of man, which James considers to have been bred into his bone and marrow, and which thousands of years of peace wont breed out of him. The desire for glory can find no gratification in menial, unskilled attention to "coal and iron mines, to freight trains, to fishing fleets, in December to dish washing, clothes washing, window washing, to road building and tunnel making, to foundries and stoke holes, and to the frames of sky scrapers". The requirements of war against neighbour alone can inspire an Oxford graduate to fight against dirt, and that for a short time only. The sense of dire

necessity and not the ambition for glory lies at the root of this inspiration. The war against bacilli may bring fame to the scientist who works in the research laboratory, but it brings no glory to the hewer of wood, who clears jungles for the expropriation and expulsion of anopheles or to the scavenger who removes refuse.

War against nature is not a noble or honourable substitute for war against neighbour. It may at the utmost open a chance. for the vicarious discharge of militarily excited nervous stimulation But vicarious discharge demoralises, debases, debilitates the system. "Sublimation" is a fantastic notion recently created by philosophers. War against dirt has very little to do with "intrepidity, contempt, softness or surrender of private interest" which are mentioned by James as inseparable accidents of war against neighbour.

War cannot be conquered by dread of war. Such dread indicates the existence of a psychopathic social condition. If war is ever to come to an end it will be by the 'contempt of war', not by the 'dread of it'. Men must learn to settle their mutual differences by a higher method than the method of 'blood and iron', or better still they must allow no occasion for differences to arise.

The material cause of war is the fluctuating inequality of power and prosperity among the nations. The efficient, psychological and final causes are (1) injury, actual or potential, done by one nation to another, (2) interference, direct or indirect, with the vested interests, real or supposed, of any powerful nation, (3) jealousy or malice aroused by sudden accession of prosperity in any nation, (4) desire of paramountcy or leadership among the great powers, (5) sheer cursedness or pure pugnacity arising out of a superabundance of energy, the excess beyond normal requirements, seeking an outlet for discharge, (6) the desire of honour and glory, (7) the desire of raising the standard of living among the people, (8) unchecked growth of population, (9) fear of losing the existing standard of living, (10) the fear of losing rank in the gradation list of nations (11) the fear of aggression.

The last cause is given as the sole cause of war by Professor McDougall in "Janus, or the conquest of war". The causes here given perhaps slightly overlap in some cases, but the psyhcology of man is so confused that clearly distinguishable causes are difficult to find. Perhaps malevolence created by the struggle for existence

is the real psychological cause of war in most cases, pretexts being invented with the help of hypocirsy and of a caricature of divine morality. The struggle for existence which evolved man out of the ape, and enabled him to circumvent the lion, the bear and the tiger, and the ancestral ape, has thickened among the western peoples by natural causes aided by the very progress of civilization, which has taken a distinctive turn in their civilization. Eastern civilization blushes to think that it is guided and controlled by the struggle for existence. Western civilization finds it glorious to declare that it has advanced by its hardness, and that consciously or unconsciously it hardens that struggle for further glory. It refuses to recognise any limit to the heightening of the standard of living, and is blinded by the fallacy that civilization is synonymous with high standard of living, irrespective of the level of thinking compatible with such standard. Indeed the incompatibility between the standards of living and thinking is the supreme cause of war. The value of thinking is judged by its conduciveness to a high standard of living. The result is that the 'ape and tiger' made of moral thinking has stuck to western civilization inspite of all its progress in superanimal activities in the fields of science and general knowledge. I have already indicated that the value of civilization lies in its power of establishing relations with nature, neighbour and God. Western civilization has violently conquered Nature, and has put God in fetters, but has failed with neighbour, with whom its relations stand where they stood in the hunting and fishing age. Relations with neighbour mean in the ultimate analysis, relations with human nature. These relations are as tumultous to-day as they were when man issued out of the ape, or when Cain killed Abel, and bluntly and indignantly told God that he was not his brother's keeper.

War may be viewed from different stand-points, such as the industrialist, the diplomatist, the nationalist and the militarist points. In these days a war generally arises in the following way :— Suppose A and B are two countries. One day a representative in parliament of the industrial interest of A asks the minister, "Is government aware that B is underselling us in foreign markets in Asia?" The minister replies, "there is no official report before me, but I shall enquire". In a month he sends to the government of B a despatch covering a hundred pages of thickly typed foolscap, whose substance is this :—"You are muddling the water of the

stream". The reply comes :—"I am not muddling the water at all. I am drinking gently, scarcely dipping the lips in it. Besides you are standing upstream, how can my muddling affect you?" The government of A confidentially directs the Field Marshall to mobilise the army, and then makes a statement in parliament appealing to the nationalism of the members and of the entire population of the country. Newspapers resound with cries of war in both countries, and in a week war is declared simultaneously, and millions of men find themselves at the front.

The appeal to the nation in the case of A reads thus :—"We told B not to muddle water. In reply he audaciously argued with us instead of instantly withdrawing his lips from the water. If we do not fight him we lose honour. Again, we want the entire stream to be left at our disposal. We may not require the whole of it at once, but our growing family will require it in a few generations. If then we do not fight against trespassers we lose our interest. Thus both divinely and humanly war has become absolutely necessary". The entire house resounds with clappings, 'hear, hear' 'encore' and other encouragements. Students in the colleges, who reside in them, not for study but for games like good christians who "to church repair not for the sermon but for the music there", at once leave their books in the care of the lecturing professor, and rush to the nearest recruiting office. The other students who have read something more than mere "Agincourt, agincourt, don't you know Agincourt?", follow them because they find it inglorious to be killed at home by bombs dropped from the sky at night, while their brethern would be gathering honour in the trenches reeking with the smoke of cigarettes, and inhaling glorious gas issuing in jets from the mouths of the devil, who eats the famous apple every day and suffers from nausea. Factory labourers have more substantial reason for downing their tools and walking to the recruiting office. There is no fear of unemployment at the front, and the remuneration is attractive. Even young women find in running an opportunity for the natural pleasures of life, which are denied them at home. Civilized man has a natural craving for change ; and he cries 'any where but here.' Thus two whole nations are gathered at the front to kill each other down. This is the long and the short of the beginning of war. The middle and the end have a different story to tell. The unknown dead must have a christian grave. His widow and children must not die of starvation, with tears of bereavement flowing from their

eyes. Taxes must be raised, or a capital levy enforced, or the currency inflated. The worker returns to the factories to find them closed. These must be reopened. But workers who had full rations at the front cannot live upon half rations at the factories now. There is uproar and tumult everywhere ; and it is found that the entire stream has been muddled from source to sea.

The industrialist of A seeks war because he is undersold. He has tried his best to prevent the arrest of the progress of the underselling by peaceful means. He has written leaders and leaderettes in newspapers showing that the underselling has been made possible (1) by the low standard of living prevailing in B, (2) by the docility of the workers of B who are made to work sixteen hours a day, (3) by night shifts, which is injurious to the health of the workers (4) by tricks played in manufacturing cheap, nasty, showy goods by which unsuspecting consumers are cheated, and (5) by new methods of organization, which are all but impossible in old countries, where the existing machinery cannot be replaced without enormous loss, and where workers have attained a certain degree of conservatism and respect for the existing economic and social order, which is essential for stability and eventual progress. He is far from sanguine regarding the efficiency of war to restore his prosperity but he thinks there is no harm in trying a chance ; the war will at least have the effect of checking new mischievous enterprise in B and in other foreign countries. It will teach them the value of caution and foresight. It will also teach them to have respect for vested interest.

The ministers seek war because the loss of market means increased financial difficulty to keep the State in order, and to keep themselves in their cosy places in the Cabinet. They feel that the attitude of the workers, exacerbated by unemployment, threats of reduced wages and lock outs, presages coming troubles, and that the only means of diverting their attention from thoughts of direct action, anti-social upheavals and class or civil war is to appeal to their nationalism, which is higher and nobler than communalism, and which finds its highest expression in killing foreigners in preference to neighbours at home,—nationalism which nationalises everything of high value in this world, namely god, blood, language, culture, civilization, morals and manners, tastes and temperaments, emotions

and instincts &c., and puts to shame socialism which nationalises such small things as coal and land.

The militarist has a genuine love of war in peace time, and generally an equal love of peace in time of war. He thinks that he is a potential Napolean, and that realization depends upon opportunity along with other advantages of an economic or emotional character.

The nationalist is a madcap. He has no ideas and he has plenty of primitive pugnacity and civilised conceit. He has no ideas because he has merged his personality into a collective personality, which has no morality except the morality of self interest, self preservation and self aggrandisement, which knows no philosophy except the philosophy of natural selection, struggle for existence and survival of the fittest, added to the philosophy of the will-to-power, will-to ascendancy, of master-morality and contempt for the human race, for equality, fraternity and liberty. He runs into war rashly, recklessly, ruthlessly and brutally, like a lunatic who is unperturbed by the distinction between right and wrong, good and evil, pleasure and pain, love and hate, and a lot of other perplexities which worry normal humanity. He seeks war because he cannot bear the boredom of peace. War is funny and peace is monotony. He would prefer barbarism if civilization had nothing better to offer than the lassitude of peace and debauchment of plenty.

It is a mistake to suppose that civilization finds its highest expression in peace. There can be no civilization without war. War creates civilization. War develops it. War sustains it. War leads to its decadence, and finally war destroys it. Western civilization has lived a rapid life, no doubt, but it is still in the adult stage of life. It has the capacity to fight many, long and great wars still. The Napoleonic war was a great war. The great war was a greater war. The greatest war is still far ahead.

There are two kinds of war, *viz.*, war against Nature and War against neighbour. They are mutually helpful. War against poverty, ignorance and illusion, against discomfort, disease and premature death is war against nature. War against neighbour includes (1) war between individuals, *i.e.*, duels (2) war between communities, *i.e.*, class war, and (3) war between nations. No body wishes that war against nature should cease. But war against nature inevitably brings man into conflict with neighbour. If

the neighbour refuses to co-operate he must be coerced. If he co-operates he must be paid a share of the booty. Man wants light to enable him to divide the booty in a peaceful way. No civilization has succeeded in dividing it satisfactorily. No civilization has succeeded in discovering the law of division or distribution. Capitalism and socialism are in conflict in this vital matter. Socialism itself is divided into several schools of thought. But more trouble has arisen from the refusal of neighbour to co-operate. Powerful man resolved on carrying on war against Nature, has either exterminated non-co-operative neighbour or enslaved him. But both processes are immoral according to mass mentality, which bases its judgment upon what is now regarded as superstition. The master mind finds that that is most moral which helps most the conquest of Nature, or the progress of civilization. This is the fundamental principle in the progress of western civilization. War, conflict and competition advance civilization ; therefore they are moral. When they will have ceased to advance it they will be abandoned as immoral. War has not yet ceased to advance civilization. It may have shifted the centre of civilization from one centre to another, from one country to another, from one continent to another, but no body can venture to affirm that it has retarted the progress of civilization. Therefore war is still moral with its double aspect of war in actu and war in posse. The league of nations has not touched the fringe of war so far. It has no programme against conflict and competition. It piously hopes to prevent actual fighting, blood shed and visible injuries to accumulated wealth. Conflict and competition reside in the mind of man. They stir the imagination and excite the nerve in a particular way. The question is, how is the excitement to subside ? James suggested that it may be made to subside by fighting, with pick axe and shovel substituted for battle axe and poison gas. Macdougall suggests that the counter irritation of fear, *viz.*, the fear of an inter-national air fleet, will find an excellent outlet for the discharge of nerve stimulation caused by the fear of neighbour's aggression, which he erroneously considers to be the root cause of war.

After analysing the commonly accepted causes of war Professor McDougall comes to the conclusion that at the bottom of each of them lies the real cause of war, *viz.*, the fear of aggression. This conclusion requires no lengthy refutation. The fear of aggression

must be well-founded or irrational. If it is irrational it is self-con demned. If well-founded, fear of aggression can only arise out of actual experience of aggressive conduct on the part of neighbour. Aggression precedes fear of aggression in the order of time. Hypocrisy has developed itself so far in the civilized world that it tries to make honest men believe that all war at the present day is defensive, that both sides in a war act in the defensive, and apparent aggression is merely defensive aggression or aggressive defence. The truth is the civilized nations feel like hungry dogs in each other's presence or like dogs in the season of rut. Germany and England had been actually feeling the canine feeling for years before the great war. The Serajevo incident was a piece of dry bone thrown out, not from a butcher's shop but from a paleontological museum. The bone is irrationally almost vulgarly called the bone of contention. But a rival nation has something in it like what Dr. Fell had in him. Benjamin Kidd calls international rivalry friendly rivalry. We shall soon hear of friendly hostility between rival nations followed by amorous war ; and of diplomatic correspondence as arrangement made for a meeting at church—a meeting, which knows no parting.

The cause of war as given by Professor McDougall is disastrous to western civilization. Fear of aggression does not mean a bare expectation existing in a nation that another nation may invade it, but means a fear that such invassion will be injurious to it, and that it may even ruin it. The quintessence of the psychology of western civilization is fearlessness. The decadence of that civilization will definitely commence with a substantial dislocation in that psychology. Throughout the argument the professor seems to have had in his mind the case of England. About the beginning of the present century England had arrived at a position of wealth, power and prosperity, which left her nothing to gain by war, but much to lose by it. Inspite of her success the Boer war convinced her that war was no longer profitable to her, and to avoid a recurrence of war in South Africa she speedily conceded self government to the Boer population along with the British settlers. It was the fear of the aggressive power of Germany that induced her to take a prominent part in the great war. The appeal to the nationalistic sentiment of the British people made by the Prime Minister on the eve of that war clearly shows that he sincerely expected great opposition from the people, on the ground that the war would be ruinous to

England. It was a lengthy speech conceived in a tone of diffidence and fear of consequences. Indeed some people in England feared that if England remained aloof, she would ultimately become a dependency of Germany. By taking part in the war she has saved herself from that humiliation, but she has saved herself at great cost. She has lost her leadership. She has acknowledged the superiority of France in military ability. She has had to acknowledge the superiority of America in everything else. She is speedily losing her position in the industrial world. Indeed the wheel of future seems to have taken a backward turn. Dean Inge in his recently published book 'England', has presented a gloomy picture of the future of England. He says, "It may well be that the historian of the future will name the year of the second jubilee of Queen Victoria or the end of the nineteenth century, or the death of the old queen, as the culminating point of England as a world power. Since then the colossus has tottered. It has been a bad sign that England, in the narrower sense, has not taken her proper place as the prominant partner. We are governed by Scots, Welsh, Irish and Jews. At the armistice after the great war we were represented by Lloyd George, Bonar Law, Lord Reading, Balfour, Geddes, Haig, Wemiss and Milner.......... We were just saved in the war ....by the readiness of our fleet and by the sacrifice of our professional army, and then only after we admitted the superior genius of the French military school........ Everything points to a coming time of trial for the nation (English nation) and Empire".

Again after analysing the industrial situation of the world in general, and of England in particular, the author continues. "In plain living and high thinking will be our salvation or the salvation of the "remnant" which will survive the turmoils of an age of transition. Plain living will be forced upon us, whether we will or not, for the conditions of prosperity are in part slipping from us, and in part are being wantonly thrown away ; high thinking will not only make us citizens of the city "whose type is laid up in heaven" but will mitigate the acerbities of a struggle for which the responsibilities cannot be laid solely on the shoulders of any one class".

Reading between the lines it appears that after having achieved and enjoyed all that western civilization had to offer, England anticipates that she cannot retain her power, prestige, leadership, comfort and high standard of living, and that she will be compelled

to live as a second or third rate power with a corresponding reduction in prestige and comfort and a lowering of the standard of living. Seeing that the essence of western civilization lies in the standard of living it will indeed be a great trial to submit to a lower standard, and adopt the principles of plain living and high thinking for salvation. It is assumed by the gloomy dean that ascendancy is a necessary concomitant of high living. Is it unlikely that plain living will come without any change in the standard of thinking? But it is here supposed that high thinking is a necessary corollary of plain living. The idea is borrowed from eastern civilization where, as in India, the Aryans after having conquered the entire continent, and having nothing more to achieve in the fields of war, power and prestige, felt a disgust for the kind of psychology which had animated them in the past. They changed this outlook upon life, their ideals and modes of behaviour towards neighbours and towards God. The life of thought replaced the life of action. The ethical process of life gradually supplanted the cosmic process. Darwinism and Nietzscheism gave way to Vedantism and Buddhism In short, animalism was supplanted by super-animalism. The transformation was voluntary. It issued out of the heart. It was not forced upon the people.

At all events, it will be a long time before the English people can accommodate themselves to the new order, and during that time they will surely not be sufficiently civilized in the eastern sense, while they will have lost most of what they have so far enjoyed of civilization in the western sense. That will indeed be a time of trial for England, still one of the most civilized countries of the world. She will try to regain her ascendancy and will probably hasten her downfall by her desperate efforts.

Professor McDougall's theory of war has a closer application to the condition of England than to any other country. Undoubtedly England has not yet fallen so low that she can be regarded as a nonentity. She still has the memory of the great past with its animating power. What is really melancholy in her position is that she is falling while others are rising. One has already eclipsed her, and it gives her no comfort to think that the nation now at the top is descended from the same stock as her own people. She is still proud of her anglo-saxon blood. But she is increasingly feeling that that particular blood has been largely diluted by other varieties of blood, if not actually corrupted. "Welsh, Scots, Irish and Jews

now rule her". One can easily appreciate the agony which overpowered the Dean when he made this acknowledgement. It was his love of truth that enabled him to write the line. England's anticipated fall will be a meloncholy event in the history of the world in the western sense. In the eastern sense also whether it will prove to be a melancholy event, cannot be foreseen now. The English people may yet feel a sincere disgust for the principles of western civilization, and accept vedantic principles not out of fear of, but out of contempt for war, conflict and competition the bedrocks of western civilization. But sooner or later every nation in the civilized world will pass through the same ordeal and accept or try to accept the eastern ideals. Whether this will be ultimately good or evil for the white man cannot be foretold. The east is now suffering because her ideals are too high. The west has begun to suffer because her ideals are too low.

There is possibly a mixture of high and low ideals, of altruism and egoism, of things spiritual and things material, of possessions which increase by distribution and possessions which decrease by it—there is possibly a synthesis ultimately beneficial to humanity, but that synthesis has not been made either by western or eastern civilization, and is not likely to be made in the present condition of human nature. There is plenty of teaching for the advancement of spiritual life in the west, and there is plenty of teaching for the advancement of animal life in the east. But these teachings do not sink into the heart. They remain on the surface. The true vedantic life is akin to a true combination of christian life and the life of western civilization. It teaches karma, jnan and bhakti. The actual vedantic combination has failed because karma was weak. Western civilization has failed because jnan and bhakti are weak. No doubt superanimal life is strong in the west, but that life is subservient to the animal life ; it serves neither God nor humanity at large. It may serve the individual or the nation for a time, but it cannot serve them beneficially for ever. The animal life in the west is either the life of the brute or the life of the beast. The brute rules and the beast obeys him. The division between capital and labour shows this clearly. As soon as the brute tries to look upon the beast as made of the same clay as himself he falls from the ideal of his civilization, that is, western civilization. For one reason or another, England is suffering from this weakness at present, and Dean Inge thinks, she is precipitating rapidly into the abyss of

equality, fraternity and false and mischievous liberty. Democracy does not belong to the essence of western civilization. It has been forced upon it by circumstances, that is, by a misdirection of that civilization, by a weakening of the will-to-power, which is the psychological basis of it. The democracy of England is a waste product of British Imperialism. The empire, that is, exploitation abroad created wealth for the middle class which gradually came to claim a share in the ruling power. The Reform Act of 1832, divided this power between the aristocracy and the middle classes. Imperialism and industrialism conspired to increase the share of the middle classes and to decrease that of the aristocracy. The latter, out of jealousy, invited the poorer classes to take a share in the government, unaware that one day the masses would turn both aristocracy and the bourgeoisie out of power. Where democracy has firmly established itself, western civilization begins to totter. Dean Inge finds that democracy is playing an important part in the decay of western civilization, and he is right. The will-to-power which was originally the monopoly of the aristocracy diffused itself over a large part of the nation as imperial necessities required for the dependencies governors and high officials who on their return home felt themselves as equal in rank to the governing class at home, and thus undermined the aristocracy. Imperialism created the plutocracy, first to rival the aristocracy and then to crush it out of existence. Plutocracy in its turn is now tottering. It is being taxed out of its power and prestige, its nobility and magnanimity, its wealth and prosperity. The Nietzschean will-to-power is now divided among forty million individuals and is therefore extremely weak. The very foundation of nordic civilization has been undermined. No wonder, Dean Inge considers that the salvation of the British people lies in plain living and high thinking, *i.e.*, in the pursuit of eastern civilization. The power over the colonies has a chequered history. Thirteen of these colonies have united into the United States, which now leads the world's civilization. The rest have become dominions nominally, but soverign states in reality. Even India, which is still called a dependency, claims the status of the dominions. With the diffusion of power the will-to-power is slackening. The fear of war is now stronger than the moral conviction that war is a relic of barbarism, which blackens the face of civilization. The cry for peace has its origin in cowardice, a growing force in the psychology of western civilization.

TYPES OF WAR.

There are three types of war, *viz.*, (1) Instinctive war waged without any definite purpose (2) War waged out of economical motives, and (3) War waged for honour and glory. Man is by instinct a warlike animal. He is pugnacious and meddlesome by nature, and when he has got a superabundance of energy he is impelled by nature to fight his neighbour out of sheer cursedness, which takes no account of consequences. He rushes to war, because the excess energy, not required for normal life, oppresses him. He feels like the musk deer, which runs wildly and furiously without knowing why. In the first stages of civilization this is the kind of war usually waged between neighbours. The instinct is a legacy from man's ancestors of the forest. Even domesticated animals find it hard to repress this instinct. Well-fed dogs snarl at each other for no assignable reason. The sea-rovers, Norsemen, Danes and Jutes, Angles and Saxons were not puritans, unable to follow their religion peacefully at home. They were not men who found the law of Malthus oppressive in the motherland. They were not criminals taken out of prison and sold to contractors to be taken over to Australia to live by honest work. They were not unemployed workers of factories and mines sent out by their government to find a home beyond the sea. They suffered from a superabundance of energy, and sailed from coast to coast to find relief. They were pretty well advanced in civilization. They could make tools and construct large boats with necessary equipments. They fought and conquered and squatted or suffered defeat or anihilation. They were non-pragmatists of the highest order. They spread civilization and advanced it without knowing what they were doing. Civilized men down to this day are unwilling to find fault with them. They find sufficient condonative circumstances, if they fail to praise them for their doings or misdoings. The musk-deer theory of human life is ordinarily designated as the spirit of adventure, a creative spirit fostered by the destructive boredom of peace. Civilization is a by-product of the vicarious activities induced by the spirit of adventure, the normal product being war or fighting for its own sake. Colonozation is impossible without the fighting spirit. War-weary ex-service men cannot make good colonists, and they refuse the benefit of state aided emigration. Colonization and civilization

are kindred facts. Both owe their origin to the innate pugnacity of human nature. We speak of this pugnacity as if it were a vicarious thing ; but that pretended loftiness of character betrays the equally forceful element of our nature which we designate as black ingratitude. This pugnacity and ingratitude have become anachronistic now, as some cultured people affect to think out of the sheer pride of civilizarion. But they are quite as virile now as in the primitive times. Only the nervous excitement by which they are accompanied is directed into vicarious channels to find relief in a mixture of mental and muscular activities, which do not prevent war, but postpone it, by the power of latency. The potentiality of war is always present in our nature.

The divine gift of pugnacity, which by small deeds and mild effusions slowly advanced western civilization through several centuries, to which the collective name of the dark age is given in modern times to indicate our ignorance of the modes in which our underlying faculty of nature manifested itself as well as the comparative ignorance which characterised the peoples of those days, suddenly burst into the light at the command of the pontiff of Rome, the vicarious apostle of Christ who called upon entire Europe to wage war against the Saracens who had hoisted the flag of Islam over the cathedral at Jerusalem. The crusades which occupied several centuries, affording adequate opportunities for all and sundry gradually came to mix the conscious motive of honour and glory with the unconscious one to find relief for the natural and divine nervous excitement caused by pugnacity. The third type of war was mixed with the first type for the first time in these crusades.

As soon as the crusades came to an ignominious end, the peoples of Europe began to contemplate a sordid, almost an abominable type of war. The heart of Europe was turned to silver and gold, the treasures of this world, which the explorations of Columbus and Vascodagama had made accessible to the people of Europe.

There is nothing strange in the fact that Jesus and Marx are both Jews, or that the gospel of hate should issue from the same spring as the gospel of love. The sweet honey and the bitter sting came from the same bee. At length the world is coming to appreciate the significance of the term "the chosen people of God." King Stork came from the same stock as King Log. The latter king, Aesop tells us, was disapproved, despised and derided by the people

of the west. God allowed them nineteen hundred years to think over the matter, and then sent King Stork.

That God chooses prophets from the chosen people is now becoming growingly clear. Jews rule everywhere in all departments of life. Spinoza was a philosophic Jew. Lenin and Trotzsky were political Jews. Ricardo was an economic Jew. Marx is a socialistic Jew. Does Dean Inge really belive in his heart that the path which Christ revealed leads to health, peace and blessedness?" If he does, why does he speak of "plain living and high thinking" being forced upon him and all his English neighbours as a curse hurled by Marx? Why does he not voluntarily accept that sublime path? The truth is melancholy. Western civilization divided man against himself; divides his beliefs from his convictions, his words from his heart, his actions from his words. There is a tinge of irony in the reference to Christ, which no Christian can tolerate. The Dean circumstantially and circumlocutorily admits that he is not a Christian, and he is able to produce excellent literary effect because he is not hampered by reverence for the Christian Saviour, but only by respect of Jesus, as a philosopher preaching to philistines.

There can be no sound reconciliation between the gospel of love and the gospel of hate, between the ideal of heavenly bliss and that of earthly comfort, between plain living and a high standard of life, between faith in God and reliance upon human power, between turning the left cheek to one who smites on the right, and smiting a neighbour on both cheeks with both hands. It is strange that the civilized white man expected the coloured people to turn the right cheek when smitten on the left, while he himself followed the policy of retaliation with double interest. The coloured people being unable to smite in return God ordained that white men should smite one another and deputed Marx to carry this principle into effect. The civilized races must now be prepared to be smitten on the face by one another, one individual by another, one sex by another, the rich by the poor, men by women, parents by children, loyalty and order by anarchy, capitalism by socialism, monarchy by democracy and aristocracy by the proletariat.

Karl Marx claims no originality in the invention of the gospel of hate. He has borrowed it from the fundamental principles of western civilization. That gospel, existing from the beginning, developed itself into colossal dimensions from the time when the

new world was discovered, with its teeming millions of inferior races. Thousands of whitemen nominally Christian, but rejuvenated followers of western civilization colonised the new world with the conscious or subconscious object of exterminating the inferior races, and taking possession of their land, property and hunting grounds, and everything they could call their own. If retributive justice has any meaning western civilization must be prepared for defeats and disappointments, disasters and catastrophes, such as the world has never known before. The gloomy Dean has a clear vision of the melancholy future, but is confused as to the real causes. He sometimes finds that true civilization should pursue such things as increase by being shared with neighbours and not such things as grow less by division.

Wherein lay the secret which made it possible for western civilization to civilize the new world quickly, even to the extent of making it outshine the Old? It was the wickedness of fighting the weak for economic ends. The second type of war, the war animated by sordidness and calculated covetousness, has been carried on with unprecedented cruelty, meanness and treachery on a scale undreamed of in primitive nomadism. Here was a notable departure from the original Nordic principles of war. The Nordics fought rivals, and disdained to fight decidedly weak enemies. But the whiteman released from the trammels of Christian teachings, found that wealth was more creative than honour, more profitable in the long run than glory. Satisfaction of greed was eagerly sought in preference to the satisfaction of pride. There was no satisfaction of pride in killing with gunpowder men who had no better weapon than bows and arrows. But the accession of wealth, actual and potential, was immense. This wealth was used to develop western civilization on industrial lines, both in the New World and the Old. Industrialism is a new phase in the progress of that civilization. The will-to-power took a new turn. It was found that real power lies not in character, but in wealth. Man subordinated himself to machine. Machine created wealth, and wealth created power. The creative power of the new type of war manifested itself in this way. England outshone all other nations in this creative power. Other nations followed, among whom was the newly created nations of the United States of America. If covetousness made England great, other nations used jealousy to rival and outrival her. Germany, the Chief among them, showed fight and England took up

arms in the defence of vested interests. She was supreme on the sea. The world's commerce belonged to her by right of continued possession. She had vested interest everywhere. Her people lived on imported food. She could not allow any other country to share that food while she required it. Germany was quickly increasing her man-power by surreptitously taking a share of the food that rightfully belonged to England. Thus there came the great war, which has dilapidated Germany and disorganized England. This war was one in which all the three types were mixed up. There was superabundance of energy with primitive pugnacity. There was conflict and clash of economic interest. There was ambition of pride, honour and glory. All three elements have suffered in the sequel. Energy and pugnacity have been curbed so far that people have become war weary, and disgusted with the creative principles of civilization. Economic interests have suffered more. Fifteen per cent of the population are suffering from unemployment in England and Germany. Pride and honour have taken a long holiday, and the nations are trying to prevent war by reducing war-power, already reduced by the great war. I have already said war for honour and glory is destructive of civilization, and western civilization in the Old world is tottering. It is thriving in the New World, because the latter cleverly kept aloof until the old world was pretty well exhausted.

War of the third type, *i.e.*, a war for honour and glory only, has become impossible now. The psychology of western civilization has become too complex for such a war. The American civil war came nearest to this type. The Napoleonic war had a large element of this type on both sides. But western civilization is changing rapidly for better or worse. We do not expect a war of this type again in the visible future. War has become sordid—a matter of pounds, shillings and pence.

The question now is not how to gain honour, but how to feed the millions who have been brought into existence by the acclerative force of western civilization, which may now be more appropriately called Industrial civilization. Industry, instead of defeating the Malthusian law, has been inextricably caught in the trap of that law. England the formeost nation in industrial civilization is the foremost sufferer. She is embarrassed financially, politically, socially, and ethically—financially by rival states, politically by

workers, and socially and ethically by women. The whole structure of society is being undermined, and the sum and substance of Dean Inge's production deals with the details of catastrophic possibilities of the prevailing condition of things.

Of all kinds of war, class war is the meanest. There is no question of pride or honour on the part of the leading classes of society in their opposition to the attempt of the proletariat to find relief from the anxities caused by unsatisfied or half satisfied hunger. It is a confession of imbecility on the part of society to say that it is unable to find employment for men who ask for work beneficial to it. It is a confession of meanness to affirm that the majority of the population should be contented with bread soaked in sweat while the minority should eat bread buttered on both sides. It is a confession of brutality to meet strike by lock-outs, to compel workers to surrender by threats of starvation and death. It is no palliation to offer emigration as the remedy for starvation. It adds insult to injury. It postulates the inferiority of the emigrants and their unfitness to live in a highly cultured society. We are sometimes told that pacifists and conscientious objectors have no right to participate in the benefits of civilization. Even Dean Inge supports this theory of social contract. An honourable and sound contract must be based upon 'give and take' in equal measures. But society under western civilization is growingly following or trying to follow the inhuman principle of giving less to the weaker classes and taking more from them. This is compendiously called exploitation. Exploitation having done its best abroad and overseas, and having almost exhausted its capacity there, has now returned home to disturb the family, to set brother against brother, sister against brother, and sister against sister. Dean Inge's denunciations against strikers and suffragettes are characteristic of the dominant psychology of western civilization. No amount of education and culture will wipe out the instincts of anger, hate, jealousy and greed from the western heart. If self-interest were not profoundly concerned, one is tempted to think that capital would have exterminated labour, and masculinity would have exterminated the feminine half of society, long ago. Machinery was invented out of jealousy against labour, and marriage is deferred out of hatred for woman. The conflict between capital and labour and the conflict between man and woman, are destructive of the social contract, and therefore

of the civilization which is founded upon it. If Pacifists have no right to enjoy the benefits of civilization when war is waged against foreigners, militarists have no right to those benefits in the case of class war. Yet the entire population in the civilized world are out for war on the one side or the other. Dean Inge is a sincere non-pacifist in both kinds of war, to the extent of being self-inconsistent. He regrets the cruelty practised on labour in the early stages of industrial civilization, but is proud of the advantages which that cruelty has achieved in the shape of increased wealth and prosperity for the English people.

Capital has left no stone unturned to keep down labour ; and the last stone turned is the application of the theory of natural selection to industrial life and civilization. Labour is weak, and in the struggle for existence against the interests of capital it was bound to be vanquished. Labour has now by the law of collective strength turned the table upon capital. The strength of nunber has proved greater than the power of wealth. Karl Marx foresaw this three quarters of a century ago. The collective strength of numbers which is so effective in international war, and which is gleefully exploited by capital in such war, is now being used against capital itself. It is heartrending to read Dean Inge's denunciation of this monstrously cruel exploitation of this collective strength for the discomfiture of capital, which, he thinks, involves the decay of western civilization. He is specially gloomy because he finds that English civilization, which might be the hindmost in the drive towards the swamp of despond and foremost in the march towards a more promising experiment in social organization, is foremost in the drive and may be hindmost in the march.

War against the weak is creative. War between equals is destructive. Diplomacy in war chiefly consists in making the enemy believe that he is weaker. Alliances are formed for this purpose. Momentary international love is improvised for conducting a successful war. Even among allied powers the spirit of war is delitescent. What is exploited is the complexity of selfinterest which civilization has created in international relations. Threats and promises are the instruments used in such exploitation. After the war has ended the allies resume their normal moods and relations.

No love is wasted between them. Diabolical suspicion replaces friendly confidence. Recriminations follow, and the ground is

cleared for fresh war, not between the old belligerents but between the old allies. England was badly exploited in the last great war, and she now finds herself undeceived. She would be glad to contemplate revenge, but she finds that her disillusionment has come too late. She has been too much exploited, and too far weakened for immediate operation. This disillusionment has been extremely painful to her. Her agonies have been aggravated by the behaviour of a section of her own people, *i.e.*, by the working classes, who instead of helping her to recover her power of revenge are taking measures to weaken her still more. Her disillusionment in this field has been more painful than what has been caused by her allies. She believed that nationalism in the English heart was stronger than socialism. She entered upon the war to arrest the tide of socialism which was flooding the land before the war. She believed that after the war this tide would begin to ebb. But contrary to experience and expectation the tide is growing stronger. The labour party is now ruling the country, and with increasing doles unemployment is increasing, and national wealth is decreasing, while national morale is rapidly vanishing. Taxation is increasing and general discontent, an unexplained psychological attitude is spreading fast, both among capitalists and workers, among the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, among men and women, in youth and adult life. What is more deplorable is the feeling of despondence which pervades the situation, specially among the class which has so far supported it most in weal and woe. Dean Inge belongs to this class.

This class has lost its wits and its sense of proportion in the distribution of national wealth and national responsibility. In the midst of general distress it finds that it has received the hardest hits. Its members have lost most in war casualties, and are suffering most by heavy taxation. It is distressed to observe that it is mulcted not so much for national benefit, as for supporting the enemies of society, the followers of Karl Marx. Like the Belgian policeman who arrested a socialist and met expostulation by denying that there was any difference between an anarchist and a socialist, Dean Inge finds no difference between a socialist and a trades-unionist. He fails to find that a trades-unionist wants to rationalise, not to nationalise, capital, and that he is as important a limb of the industrial system as the capitalist. He is no doubt one of a million but under the joint stock system, a capitalist is also in most cases,

one of a high arithmetical figure, say, half a million. There is no reason why a capitalist, as such, should have a higher standard of living, more leisure and more freedom than an operative. The view of society as an organic whole, which has so far advanced western civilization, is now giving way. The fact is ominous for that civilization ; and one must particularly deplore it when it affects England, which has so far held the leadership in the progress of it. We are told that poltroonery of capital is met by unimaginable wickedness on the part of labour, which refuses to give enough work for its wages, for honesty on the part of the worker encourages enhanced dishonesty on the part of capital. Labour is said to shirk work because, "to do good for a capitalist employer is merely to help a thief to steal more successfully". It is also said that workers resort to 'sabotage and ca'canny. We are told that "this ruinous device has been carried further in England than in any other country. To the objection that it will reduce the nation to bankruptcy the answer is that such is the intention of its promoters." "There is no disguising the fact" says the Dean, "that the country is in a state of chronic civil war, and that the forces of law and order are on the defensive against anti-social organizations which have no aim except to wreck the state and destroy our existing civilization. England is a house divided against itself". "The nation" says Lowis Dickinson, "is dividing into two antagonistic sections". This sectionalism is a new thing in English history."

Having convincingly proved that England has largely fallen in power and honour, and is rapidly declining in wealth and standard of living ; having profoundly regretted also that England was no longer governed by Englishmen, but by aliens such as Welsh, Irish, Scots, and Jews, Dean Inge boldly concludes his famous book thus :— "This much I can avow that never, even when the storm cloud appears blackest, have I been tempted to wish that I was other than an Englishman." "This reminds one of D. L. Roy's famous song in which he said, "I was born in India, and I wish I may die in India." It also reminds one of Mrs. Micawber's exclamation addressed to her husband while in extreme distress, "never, never shall I desert you". What is most striking in the sentence is that racialism is stronger than nationalism or humanism in the western heart. This racialism is nothing better than developed tribalism, a brutal sentimentalism, which has descended from the days of the

Sagas, when Nordic civilization was developing itself in the primival woods.

Perhaps the Dean has a complete record of the history of his family from the days of Hengist and Horsa, on which he bases his racial pride as an Englishman. But most Englishmen who have this pride surely do not possess such record. This fact is enough to prove that racial pride is not only inhuman but based upon unreality. Yet racial pride constitutes the highest driving force in western civilization inspite of Darwinism, which, though it does not regard degeneration as impossible, derives its value mainly from the notion of evolution. The Dean himself believes in evolution, and yet joyfully carries the burdensome pride of race in his heart. Nordicism seems stronger than Darwinism in the Englishman's heart. But pride of race is essentially a degenerative force in the psychology of man ; and Englishmen are badly suffering from psyhcopathic condition. No wonder England is losing her position in the world as described by the Dean and other authorities on the subject of European degeneration. Indian politicians interdicted intermarriage to prevent pollution of blood. But the prohibition has never existed in Europe. Racial pride is based upon unreality in the civilized world now ; and false pride is poisonous by its nature.

THE DICTATOR OF THE MICROCOSM.

Stormy waves of self-consciousness are surging in the ocean of humanity to-day. Woman, worker, weak race, worn-out spirit are all becoming self-conscious. They are acquiring a new consciousness,—a knowledge of their rights and capacities, probably also of their responsibilities. The family, the society, the political world and the spiritual universe are all in commotion. The moral atmosphere appears to have undergone a drastic change and the tumult seems to be its external manifestation. I propose to trace this vigorously-developing and expanding self-consciousness to its source. In the meanwhile some preliminary explanation may be useful.

Vertebrate self-consciousness expresses itself in self-assertion. Melting lava cannot long remain concealed in the bowels of the volcano. Self-assertion in the world, as it is, confounded by centuries of exploitation and expropriation, involves a just or unjust derogation from vested interest. It means a claim, rightful or wrongful, upon things in other people's possession which the latter are not willing to part with, and are prepared to fight for. The law of limitation is set up by way of defence ; but its validity is denied by the newly-acquired self-consciousness of the aggressive party. Sometimes the issue is attempted to be made to stand on expediency, that is, on future consequences affecting society, sometimes upon rights acquired by the social contract. The validity of the contract is denied on the ground, first, that woman was not a party to it ; secondly, that it is oral, unregistered, uncertain, unsound, not freely executed, but acquiesced in by ninety per cent. of the executants under the circumpressure of the caste and set, manufactured by the other ten per cent. The original nature of man is put forward as the real nature in contrast with the second nature of man created by art and varied by it. The aggressive party is in doubt whether it wishes to go back to primitive conditions, or is inspired by the aspiration to create a third or higher nature in man by barbaric violence or by refined art.

Whatever that may be it is evident matters are coming to a crisis ; and crisis means war, which, in spite of all our boasted civilization, is still the final arbiter in all questions concerning natural

or divine justice. War is the outward expression of hate. Hate means the perversion of the ethics of amity into the ethics of enmity,—a partial reversion to pre-social moral condition. It means, in short, demo ralization. And when demoralization sets in it acts like a gangrene. Nobody can tell where it will end.

We are accustomed to distinguish between natural right and artificial right, though we are not clear as to what is nature or what is art. The war referred to in the preceding paragraph is between natural right and artificial right. Artificial right is created somewhere by the destruction of natural right elsewhere. Self-consciousness has for its object the restoration of the *status quo ante*. But we are apt to forget in the argument that the natural right of living beings in general, and of man in particular, is synonymous with might, and this right must stand at the back of the desire to deprive anybody of his artificial rights. In plain terms men must prepare themselves for war before claiming rights in the possession of others. This natural right, the ultimate dispenser and arbiter of all rights, may rush to the field at once, or assume a formal dialectic attitude with the oblique fiery glances of a diplomatic plenipotentiary, not with the humility and homeliness of a beggar. The success of self-consciousness depends upon might, kinetic or potential, active or argumentative. In other words, one must possess himself of the muscles and sinews of natural right before one can think of depriving anybody of an artificial right. Where self-consciousness is not accompanied by the acquisition of this supreme natural right it has no value ; it is invertebrate. Now this supreme natural right may come in two ways, the one positive and the other negative. More generally the two ways present themselves simultaneously. The person in possession may have become weak by long indulgence in an artificial and unjust right, or the self-conscious claimant may have gathered positive strength, no matter how. It may be remarked however that before the distinctly visible appearance of self-consciousness there elapses a period, long or short, during which growing weakness on the one side is attended by growing strength on the other. This is the period of the incubation of self-consciousness. An utterly mean, cowardly, worthless man can never acquire self-consciousness. The very birth of self-consciousness shows that desire was partially preceded by desert, and that the desire of self-assertion has grown in parallel lines with deservingness. The truth seems to be that

by a law of nature weakness becomes weaker, and strength grows stronger until a certain maximum is reached. Where readjustment of rights begins to take place automatically, wisdom suggests the expediency, for the holder of vested interest, of conceding recognised rights as soon as self-consciousness makes its appearance in those at whose expense they are enjoyed. Evasion, prevarication, equivocation, tantalisation and desperate unscruplousness create rancour out of proportion to the purpose which they are intended to serve. Every hour by which the readjustment is wrongly postponed creates new chances of tragic consequences. It is unwise to dam up the course of evolution, for obstructed evolution expresses itself in revolution. The Mississippi and the Missouri glide down smoothly and quickly, but the Niagara, though a smaller stream, makes a great noise. The latter attracts visitors of a reckless noisy character, who find beauty in terror and frightfulness ; not in peace, but in war ; not in love, but in hate.

What is this noisy self-consciousness ? Is it a phenomenon of cognition or one of emotion, or of a combination of both ? If it is a combination, which is the more dominant element ? Psychology says that man is a self-conscious animal : his superiority to other animals consists in his self-consciousness. If this is so, where lies the newness of the self-consciousness of which we hear so much in these days in the press and on the platform ? Were the people, who are now acquiring self-consciousness, devoid of it before ? Is the new consciousness a special creation or a new dispensation ?

The truth is that the self-consciousness which is making so much noise is old, yet new ; old in substance, new in form ; old in age, but young in strength. It was asleep before, it has become awake now. Perhaps the dead has come to life ; and therein lies its newness. This is one way of looking at the thing. It is not philosophical, but commonplace and political.

Another explanation is that a single individual is never spoken of as acquiring self-consciousness, for he already possesses it. It is an aggregate of individuals that are said to acquire it, when they are organised into a corporation, or, in other words, when they acquire the consciousness of corporate life, when the aggregate is transmuted into an organism. The Hindu priest before beginning to worship the clay image of God goes through the ceremony, called *pranpratistha*, or life-giving. He may be superstitious but not

illogical. He does not worship the clay in the form of man, but the living spirit, invoked or created by him and embodied in the clay. It is thus that life is breathed into the aggregate, which is transfigured into a living corporation with a will and purpose of its own, often different from the will of the individual or that of all the individuals taken separately. It has interest unlike those of the individuals, and sometimes of an antagonistic nature. Yet it is rightly said a corporation has no soul. That means it has no immortality ; no responsibility beyond the near future. It may achieve glory or bring disaster on itself, but it has no eschatological heaven or hell to arouse hope or fear. Its morality is more cosmic than ethical. Hate is decidedly stronger in its bosom than love. Many personalities fused into one make a formidable personality, a *virat purush.*

The explanation, though it has a fascination for the intellect or the reasoning faculty, lacks fulness, because it has a look of unreality in it. The Corporation is an abstraction. Our nature looks for a more concrete something in the self-consciousness of a group of persons. In the presence of the Corporation the individual does not wholly lose his individuality. Its opinion is public opinion ; and public opinion is the opinion of individuals strengthened by mutual agreement. What then is the relation of the individual's consciousness to the consciousness of the collective personality ?

The life of the collective personality has a definite purpose or permanent mission. It is a pure, unadulterated purpose. That life possesses virility and vigour in proportion to the purity or singleness of its purpose. A mixed purpose is destructive in character, and proves disastrous in proportion to the strength of the adulteration. That purpose is self-preservation developing into self-aggrandisement by evolution. There are two things to bear in mind in this connection : (1) that the purpose or mission incubates somewhere before the birth of the Corporation or organism, and (2) that evolution is used in two distinct senses : it is used by theosophists in the sense of the unfodling of a germ, and by biologists in the sense of epigenetic growth by differentiation and integration. In the theosophist's sense the germ of self-aggrandisement exists in concealment before self-preservation appears, and gradually grows, into full manhood and power. In the biologists' sense the idea of self-aggrandisement is in the beginning non-existent, and gradually

grows by the favourable influences of environment. In my opinion the theosophists' sense is more in consonance with the facts of experience. The idea of self-aggrandisement, flying in the air somewhere, brings the collective life into existence, and then embodies itself in the abstract personality of the Corporation. Self-aggrandisement being the primordial purpose unwilling to show itself openly, creates for itself a hiding place in self-preservation, which is never ashamed of itself, and can proudly appear in public. Hence in argument with critics self-preservation takes the field, while in action it is self-aggrandisement that prompts the organism from behind the screen. There is an analogy between self-preservation and self-aggrandisement on the one hand, and fate and freewill on the other. In argument fate is prominent : in action free-will is unfettered.

I have already hinted that in the exposition of the self-consciousness of a collective personality we look for a more concrete or tangible something. That something incubates in the consciousness of the individual person ; and when the incubation is general, the new thing is abstracted from the general consciousness of the individual and given a separate place. When this process has spread over a comparatively large area, that is, among a large number of men, the collective personality is born. It begins life with a cry, like a new-born babe, and slowly gathers strength by mother's milk and external nutriment. The self-consciousness of the collective personality, then, has its root in the self-consciousness of individuals.

When we speak of self-consciousness we are supposed to know what self means. Is it a simple or elementary substance, or, is it a complex of substances ? Is it a unity or a plurality ? Chemists distinguish varieties of substances, namely, elements, compounds, mechanical mixtures, solutions, fusions, amalgams, alloys. If the self is a plurality, what is the nature of the cohesive force that keeps the elements bound to each other? James considers the self to be a unified plurality. He divides the constituents of the self into two classes, (1) the pure ego and (2) the self as composed of the material self, the social and the spiritual self. The material self consists of the body, the clothes and the family,—the last consisting of parents, wife and children. "They are," says man, "bone of my bones, flesh of my flesh." When they are gone a part of his

self is gone. If they do anything wrong it is his shame. If they are insulted his anger flushes forth as readily as if he stood in their place. Our home comes next. Then our property and the products of our hands or brains. "A man's social self is the recognition which he gets from his mates." "Properly speaking a man has as many social selves as there are individuals, who recognise him, and carry an image of him in their mind." "A man's fame, good or bad, his honour or dishonour are names for one of his social selves." "Nothing is commoner than to hear people discriminate between their different selves thus : 'As a man I pity you but as an official I must show you no mercy ; as a politician I regard him as an ally, but as a moralist I loathe him." "By the spiritual self, so far as it belongs to the empirical ME, I mean a man's inner or subjective being, his psychic faculties or dispositions, taken concretely."

In the name of truth what a congeries of selves is congested in the small word 'self'? What an overcrowding of personalities in a veritable black-hole ! Their name is legion. Each of us seems to live like the wretched man on the Gaderene Coast from whose head Christ drove out thirty-thousand spirits,—counting by the number of swine that committed suicide by drowning themselves in the sea, on the spirits entering into them.

Mathew Arnold and most cultured people discriminate between the higher self and the lower self. We also distinguish between the mortal self and the immortal self ; the true self and the self of illusion. Where hides the self which we have in mind when we speak of the self-consciousness recently acquired by Woman, Worker, Subject Race and Natural Man? It is none of the selves that the professor so elaborately brings into light. It is the pugnacious, noisy self in man that hates peace and contentment ; and loves the noise and smoke of boilers and chimneys, the din and clatter of arms, the roar of guns and the blood of men.

James suggests such a self, but does not mention it specifically. He speaks of the family as part of the self, and gives reasons for so speaking. He might have spoken with equal reason and conviction of the nation, the race, the class or caste, the profession, the religion, the sex of an individual as parts of his or her self. Every person has a racial self, a national self, a regional self, a sexual self, a class self, a professional self and a religious self. There are as many types of Hate as there are selves of this type. The sexual

self of woman rouses her to revolt against the domination of man. The class self of the labourer rouses him to revolt against the capitalist, and so forth. The multitudinous selves in man have each a distinct interest of its own. The special interest of one self may be congenial or uncongenial to another self. But as a rule, the selves are at war with one another by nature. The total organism is kept in order by the domination of one of the selves over the rest. This ruling self guides, controls, subordinates, sacrifices, neglects, loves or hates, the other selves, who are compelled to place all their resources at his disposal. Thus when we speak of a subject race acquiring self-consciousness we mean that the racial self of the individuals belonging to that race has secured the throne in the association of selves living and working within him. But none of the selves can permanently occupy the throne or reside in White House. The national self has for a long time been so residing in the heart of the man of the West. There are signs, though yet very indistinct, to show that its term is coming to a close, and that some other self will take its place. A sort of revolution takes place in the heart of man when one self is dethroned and another takes its place. This revolution means that the individual has changed his character, has acquired a new nature, is stimulated by new facts, makes new responses to old stimuli, and is indifferent to other facts which used to shake him violently before. When the racial self has acquired the supremacy, the individual thinks of his own race ; he thinks of other races. He thinks of the present inferiority of his race and the present superiority of the ruling race, and he thinks of future possibilities, favourable to the one and adverse to the other. Love and Hate have taken a new direction ; both have been roused into life. But Hate is more energetic, more dynamic than Love.

The selves are susceptible to weariness, disease and death. They have hours of wakefulness and sleep. They suffer from debility and anœmia. Climate, specially moral climate, has great influence over them. Peace debilitates the national self. General prosperity debilitates the class self and the professional self and also the sexual self. In a word all that is good in life weakens these selves. The worse the climate, the better their health. Such is the abnormal character of these selves. As soon as they begin to assert themselves one may easily guess there is some screw loose somewhere : the world is out of joint.

In the self-consciousness which was vigorously aroused in the peoples of Europe at the beginning of the Great War, it was the national self of each person that was stimulated, tingled and titillated, that lost its balance, grew despotic and arbitrary, insensate and irrational, and by these aberrations acquired complete supre-supremacy over his other selves,—his bodily self, his family self, his spiritual self and all other selves working in mutual friendly antagonism within him. The result is that the War by the reaction of its termination has left the world weary, weak and demoralized intellectually and ethically.

In time of foreign war internal peace is automatically secured, because Hate rushes to the front with his family and effects, leaving Love in charge of domestic affairs. This Love is a creature of Hate, and rules as vice-gerent to gather munitions for his Chief now at the front. Similarly the multitudinous selves in man forget their differences and antagonisms for the time being and submit themselves unconditionally to the dictates of the national self when foreign wars disturb inter-national relations. During the World War there was no Irish War, no class war, no sex war, no strikes, no suffragette movements in England. Even the House of Commons with its Liberals and Conservatives, its Nationals and Radicals, its Irish members and Ulster members, seemed hushed to silence as if Lord Kitchener had proclaimed the necessity of general domestic peace, and placarded the streets with "Let there be peace within to strengthen the fierceness of war without," in blazing capitals. The national self was absolutely supreme in man, in woman, the subject man, the working man and all shades of men. The national self-consciousness had become red-hot, and all other kinds of self-consciousness had become cool, humble and submissive, strong in their weakness, noble in their slavishness, and splendid in their self-sacrifice. They had flung aside their self-assertiveness, their claims to attention, their mutual jealousies, and other passions. The confederation of selves had turned themselves into a commonwealth with national self-consciousness as its dictator.

Gradually the dictator became weary, and Hate became restive ; and as soon as the War terminated, strikes and Irish affairs took a serious turn. The adventures of Napoleon out of France were mostly prompted by the necessity of keeping the Republic of selves in healthy and good order. Hate is undying and it stands on a

free fulcrum permitting of cross gyrations—the guns of the artillery are best turned towards foreign foes.

In the Great War the national self was at its best in the German heart. The German was stigmatised as too docile, too humble and submissive. The criticism was based upon ignorance and error. The national self was vigorous, more vigorous in him than in the Allies. The other selves surrendered themselves at discretion,. and joyfully accepted unprecedented risks and sacrifices. The Germans gave their money and muscles, their blood and bones without stint. They were overpowered by superior strength, but not by the strength of a superior national self residing elsewhere. Their very enthusiasm in the service of the national self hastened exhaustion and eventual disaster. The national self in the British heart was more discreet and exhibited greater prudence on the whole, though there were fluctuations leading to coalition and change of Ministers. Victory was won at the front, but the discreetness, the mildness, and the prudence of the national self kept the other selves in fairly good strength, and the result was that the Armistice was followed by the self-assertion of the racial self in Ireland and elsewhere, of the class self in the mines and factories, and of the regional self in the overseas dominions and dependencies. These man-created selves are noisy, depreciative and injurious to the true self, the higher self, the permanent, immortal self. The fate of Central Europe shows that a strong national self-consciousness is not an unmixed blessing ; and the troubles in Western Europe indicate that this particular self-consciousness in any strength, London proof or under proof, is like alcohol, unwholesome in the long run. The higher self is impoverished and humbled in the general tumult of the art-created selves. In the West these selves are stronger than the true self, which is slowly receding into the back ground with the not very remote risk of being annihilated. Spiritual development in Europe is positively in a decadent condition now. As to morality, the ethics of Hate have largely supplanted the ethics of Love, and competition is unmistabably stronger than Co-operation at this moment. Remembering the wisdom of Mr. Wilkins Micawber's opinion that a difference of six pence in expenditure with an income of twenty shillings leads either to disaster or to happiness in the long run, we may guess what the future has in store for the world. The national self seems to work on the mind of the West like the spirits that caused the swine on the Gaderene

Coast to commit suicide. It is self-destructive. Thousands of wretched people in 1914 rushed to the front in enthusiasm, and sacrificed themselves in spite of Spencer's principles of ethics which gives to egoism a superior place over altruism, and in spite of James' psychology which makes the body self of the individual the centre of his existence, the pivot on which hangs the balance by which the value of truth is weighed.

Does no self-consciousness exist in the mind of the Indian? Surely it exists; for self-consciousness is man's birth-right, and the Indian is a man. Why then do the optimistic platform politicians declare with a glorious, trumpet voice that India is becoming self-conscious? They are not in error, yet they are not accurate. The old consciousness has been readjusted to new conditions. In place of the old spiritual self dominating in the heart, some form of the material self is presiding over the Republic of selves in the heart of many. This was inevitable. India has for the last one thousand years been placed in contact with foreigners in whom the will to live is strong; attachment to mundane affairs is all-pervading, and cosmic life with its hard struggle for existence is predominant,—foreigners whose communion with God is not illuminating, but is limited to exchange of ideas, such as what we experience in common life in social intercourse, carried on for purposes of self-preservation and race-preservation, between the strong and the weak, the resourceful and the helpless, the proud and the humble,—foreigners, whose ideals as well as realities of life are antithetical to ours. This contact with foreigners has been on unequal terms, in which the Indians all along have been in the position of disadvantage. Foreign ideas have more or less freely affected their lives, while indigenous ideas have had no adequate opportunity of spreading among the obtrusive guests. Thus the change has been one-sided. Indian thought has changed, but Islamic and Christian thought, Pathan, Mongolian and British thought remain unaltered and apparently almost unaffected by the contact. The truth is India is now presenting an amalgam of spiritualism and materialism, strange yet susceptible of explanation. The change which has taken place during the last half a century is marvellous, though melancholy.

What is this change? It may be explained in a few words. The centre of gravity in the mass of agglomerated substances called the mind is changed. In the commonwealth of selves the

ascendancy has passed from one set of selves to another : from the spiritual to the material. Among the material selves James counts the body, clothes, family and private property to which I may add profession, class, nation and race. In the beginning of English education in India imparted through the bazar, the streets, and in a feebler manner through the schools, the attention of young-men was directed to the care which Englishmen bestow on the body, the clothes, the food, the comforts of life. Their attention was next drawn to the difference of honour and public respect paid to different professions ; and they instinctively felt a predilection for one profession in preference to another. As to class, India had already stratified and petrified the thing into castes. In course of time the *nation* came to engage a share of their attention. All these things, it must be borne in mind, belong to the category of material self according to James ; but it is possible to divide into high and low. The self of clothes and food occupies the lowest place. The national self occupies the highest. Young men are to be congratulated when they fling aside fine clothes and fine food, and take to nationalism ; for that means a distinct move from the lower to the higher. But both are very low when viewed by the side of the spiritual self. Yet the majority prefer the national self to the spiritual self. The value of the national lies in the fact that it helps the spiritual self to find scope for its activities. But the national self leads men astray when it takes the supreme place in the Republic of selves, and becomes its despotic president. Man loses value in proportion as the spiritual self receives less and less attention and honour, not in actual life only but also in the ideal. This then is the significance of the new self-consciousness of which we speak with so much splendid emphasis as a rise in Indian life. As already said attention paid to nationalism is superior to attention paid to clothes, food and drink ; and in so far the new self-consciousness is welcome as an upward movement. The national self has however a grave draw-back. It is treacherous. It comes into power as minister, not as king, pretending to subserve the interests of the spiritual self as an auxiliary, and then furtively works its way and deposes its chief. On the pretext of spreading love it diffuses hate, the result coming out in the shape of a complex mixture of sham love and real hate. This process has throughout marked its course in the West ; and there is very little reason to suppose that it will take a different course in India, where the moral

climate has been already largely poisoned, and the struggle for existence is rapidly increasing in hardness, necessitating recourse to qualities which distinguish the ape and the tiger on the one hand, and the fox and the crow on the other. Biological evolution is misunderstood when it is supposed that it has no susceptibility to a backward movement. It has now been discovered by biologists that certain ape kinds are "not ancestors but degenerate descendants of man". Cultural development or evolution has a greater proneness to move backward than forward ; and who can tell whether the new self-consciousness in India has come as a regenerative or as a degenerative force. Swine are pulled backward by the tail when the object is to make them move forward. Is *Mahamaya* pulling India in the same way for her regeneration?

In India nearly all the selves are invertebrate as the result (1) of physical environment, which disfavours the gladiatorial life by providing beforehand all that man requires for wholesome existence and (*b*) by disinclining man to crave for material possessions not required for such existence, and (2) by culture, which foresees at every step the debasing influence of high life, and places the spiritual self at the top of the commonwealth of selves. The supremacy of any of the selves is weak and unstable. One self is easily dethroned by another, and the latter is soon dethroned by a third. The national self sometimes shows vigour ; the spiritual self comes next to rule ; and in a short time the æsthetic self asserts itself. But even this self is inverteberate, for though the desire for enjoyment may be strong, that of acquiring possession of the requisite materials is weak. Self-consciousness expresses itself feebly in self-assertion, if at all. The will to live is weak, and the will to shine is weaker. The trouble with the Hindu is not how to prolong life, but how to put an end to it. Suicide is futile where belief in the principle of rebirth is firm. The will to live must go, or there can be no salvation. So long as this is the dominant sentiment the national self can never acquire permanent vigour and supremacy. That self can at best subserve the life of the spiritual self, and has value only as a subservient self. This is the keynote of Hindu philosophy ; and philosophy has permeated the life of the Hindu more thoroughly than that of any other people. Christian philosophy, that is, the essence of Christanity, as an exotic, never permeated Western life, and is now in process of being rapidly ejected out of it by the philosophy of evolution which traces man's ancestry

much further back than human life, and confirms in man the natural desire, reinforced by the pride of pedigree, to shine as the remote ancestors shone millions of ages ago. The ape and tiger quality which lingers in man is lauded and encouraged and re-invigorated by special culture. The ethics of the national self is the ethics of enmity and hate. The ethics of amity is subordinated, subdued, subverted and made subservient to the ethics of hate. The struggle for existence is purposely made keener by fusing it up with the struggle for aggrandisement, and by creating needless wants which prompt exploitation. Exploitation leads to conflict, and conflict leads to war ; and war gives scope for the remote ancient inherited qualities of man to display themselves. The dependency of India would have been more acceptable and toothsome to England, if the people were stronger, more pugnacious, more vigorous, more willing and able to resist aggression. This would have increased the zest of life, the enthusiasm and exaltation of conquest which characterize the life of the West, and makes it worth living. But she is disappointed. The truth is that the possession of India, while it has added to her material wealth, has been draining her wealth of gladiatorial morality. It has demoralized her in the same way as the very opulence of Nature demoralized the immigrant nomadic Aryans who occupied India about six thousand years ago. It has turned her attention from the spirit of effort to the enjoyment of material, from dignified, though barabric, militancy to sneaky but profitable industry ; from lion-hunting to patridge-shooting ; from the vigorous roughness of life to the effeminate comforts of it. Compare the character of the first British adventurers who came to India, and came again and again though most of them lost their lives either by the foundering of ships, by malaria or by the bullets sent to greet them out of Portugese guns, with that of the average Eng lishman of the afterwar period who comes to India for comfort or refuses to come even as a Civil Servant because comfort is mixed with risks.

The old spirit of adventure is on the wane. Preference for Hindu philosophy is imperceptibly spreading in the West, filtering down from the most cultured intellects, inspired by divine discontent and a refined disgust with the gladiatorial view of human life ; and should the underlying spirit of that philosophy get adequately strengthened and diffused the difference between the East and the West will slowly disappear. On the surface, particularly in India,

we see the West spreading over the East, but deeper insight will show that if the West is demoralizing the middle region of the Eastern intellectual life, the East is leavening the higher strata of Western life slowly and steadily. The West has nearly exhausted her militant energies, her warlike passions, her pugnacious interventions, her desire for finding scope for those qualities of man which she has inherited from her remotest ancestors. The desire to find scope for the acquired qualities of man, obtained with the help of science and philosophy is slowly growing within the bosom of the West. The Aryans in India having conquered the continent, established empires and built cities, and having tasted to the limits of satiation the splendour and glory of a conquering comfortable life, fell into deep contemplation, confounded by the enormities of inequality, developed by material civilization ; and bewildered, instead of being fascinated, by the squalor and poverty of the masses ; by the miseries caused by Nature and Art in combination ; in one word, by the illusions of life ; and concluded that the life hitherto lived by them was not worth living. Something of the kind seems to be coming over the surfeited West, obscurely, slowly, indistinctly but steadily. She is increasingly suffering from the misery of opulence. Unlucrative sympathy is slowly stealing over her. Unmixed chauvinism is giving way to soft words though still supported by the big stick at the back. Cruelty for its own sake is deprecated. Preference for the simple life is percolating from cultivated into half-cultivated soil. In short, Western life is imperceptibly assuming an Indian orientation both in intellectual and moral realization.

In the meanwhile self-assertion is emerging at the weakest parts, in woman and labouring man, among plebeians and paupers, indirectly to facilitate the process of Easternisation. The self-consciousness which is springing up in the lower strata of life has come for the subversion of life, as it is, and for the ultimate supervention of a new life. It will make some noise in the world for sometime, and will then be hushed into the general silence that will follow. It is a recrudescence of war of each against all, and the new life that will follow will be a new experiment in human organisation, based on the principle of the supremacy of the pure ego, not in the sense of the Vedanta, which represents the pure ego as the universal self, not as the self which distinguishes one individual from another, upon the principle of unlimited, ultimate, perfect freedom, which is never disturbed by the appetites and

passions, by neighbour's complaints or interference, by illusions and halucinations, by the action of praasites, by sexual jealousies, by the demoralization of private property or by the fear of the Magnified Man. Possession of goods will not entail dispossession; distribution of it will not involve diminution. The life will be spiritual, concerned with limitless things and joys which increase in mass and density paradoxically by the force of diffusion.

The new upheaval of self-consciousness which is disturbing the peace of the world is the last flicker of the lamps of life, fed by the oil of Western culture, which instead of heartily opposing the cosmic process has been used as an instrument of reinforcement for purposes of the struggle for existence, hardened and intensified by the creation of new wants, æsthetic in origin and physiological in development, invigorating the ape and tiger fitness for survival with the ethics of enmity and the gospel of hate. Rabindranath Tagore in his *Nationalism in the West* discovers what he regards as a strange paradox, namely, an antethesis between the nation of the West and the spirit and civilization of the West. Unmixed denunciation of the West is neither logical nor courteous, and is therefore unlikely to be listened to with patience. Prudence dictates a compromise between truth and untruth, when the call of truth is weaker than the desire for ameliorative change. Bitter criticism is made toothsome by being seasoned with courtesy and deception like the sugared pill. By the spirit of the West Dr. Tagore means the spirit of the small faction of the uppermost layer of culture which has received an Indian orientation. He is supposed to know that this spirit is not the dominant spirit of the West but only imperceptibly budding in a promising quarter of the mighty forest of Western civilization. The truth is there is no antethesis, no incompatibility, no antagonism, and no paradox concerned. The nation is the child of the civilization, intellectual and moral. And the most charitable explanation of the error into which Tagore has fallen is that in thinking of civilization he has taken inadequate account of its moral aspect, and in looking at the nation he has confined himself entirely to that aspect of civilisation. The nation is the child conceived by the union of the sperm cell of intellecttuality and the germ cell of morality. To reprobate the nation while praising the civilisation is to ignore the law of heredity,—to make the lioness, the queen of the forest, bring forth a fox, a scavenger and a menial. The civilization of the West, very slightly

touched by the diffusion of Christianity, (see Spencer's '*Principles of Ethics* Vol. I', page 323) has ever been a phenomenon of continuous development of the primitive brute instincts of man, which manifest themselves in self-assertion, and unceasingly cry for supremacy, ascendancy and leadership. The discovery of the royal Malthusian Theory of Economics and its Imperial Cousin of Biology, I mean the Darwinian Hypothesis, was impossible in India, where Nature was generous, and neighbour uninterfering and forbearing, while the culture of the people taught man to look upon poverty as indicating no demerit, if not to accept it as a divine gift bestowed on him to facilitate uninterrupted, unencumbered attention to the spiritual self. On the other hand, the discovery was comparatively easy in the cold mountainous West where Nature, though opulent at heart, was shy, outwardly cold and irresponsive ; and Neighbour was intrusive, virile, violent and avaricious ; where Nature originated the struggle, and Neighbour developed it and made it fiercer. The truth is that the West and its social organisation furnished an excellent field for observation and for the verification of the truth of the struggle for existence, of the development of its periphery of passions and cunning, and of the aspirations generated by its increasing fierceness. The theory of the survival of the fittest, in the biological sense, readily received acceptance among the people, in spite of the feeble and half-hearted protest of the churchman, because it was in full accord with their experience, and was highly congenial to their thoughts and feelings. It appealed to their intellect and their emotions as a faithful mirroring of the character of Nature and Neighbour. The hypothesis freely permeated the ethics of the people, and firmly established their culture and civilization on the old bedrock, whose strength was rediscovered and reinforced by a new cement. The national self in the man of the West, naturally strong, has been equipped with a new whetting instrument for sharpening its accustomed ethical weapon. To speak more plainly the ethics of enmity which are the ethics of the national self have received a formidable impetus by the theory of the survival of the fittest, applied to the development of human culture. The Darwinian Hypothesis by urging the inevitableness of the survival of the fittest has added a terrific momentum to the old civilization of the West, which, be it remembered, was but slightly touched by the semmon on the mount. Civilization, there, was never a conflict between the cosmic and the ethical process ;

and now the latter is vigorously and jauntily subserving the aspirations of the former process. The West has so far made no sincere effort to pit the microcosm against the macrocosm, Art against Nature, Love against Hate. With all her marvellous achievement in science, and in the acquisition of power over Nature and weak Neighbour the West has never attempted to make the impossible possible, to create human without the help of brute excellence. She has never swum against the tide, but always with the current with the result that her progress has been rapid and even dazzling. One might almost say it has been shocking. She was perhaps wise ; for the true spiritual life follows and does not precede the animal life. The latter life must have time to fully or approximately exhaust itself before it can make room for the former. That consummation is slowly approaching. As already indicated the upper layers of Western life are getting imbued with true spirituality, which is slowly filtering downward with the help of changing environment. The West is moving in the same line as India did three thousand years ago. Kurukshetra is not a mere geographical term. It has a spiritual meaning and value. It means the harbinger of *dharma* and the vindication of it. It regenerates by destruction ; recreates by annihilation. It kills the excellence of brute life, of militarism, of power and of the spirit of ascendancy ; ushers in the spiritual life with its true freedom and its indifference to material and sensuous æstheticism ; and opens up a new vista of wondrous joys from which the cosmic life of man is debarred by divine decree ; and then the old glories achieved by the united power of the macrocosm and the microcosm, like the effusions and escapades of enthusiastic youths, provoke a regretful smile in the face of the prime of humanity.

India forming a small fraction of humanity having, by her premature exhaustion of animalism, outrun the rest of the world, where the cosmic life was in full swing, became afterwards partially dislodged by external pressure, from her lofty spiritual height, and slowly reinoculated and recorrupted with the virus of animal life. In the new mixture of the animal and the spiritual life the power required for self-preservation was weaker than the desire to maintain it. This mixture, defective in character, has come down to the present generation. The new national self-consciousness tries to improve the mixture by adding the element of power to that of desire.

Western civilization now virtually embraces the entire world with its outstretched arms. Its spirit has permeated entire humanity, while the latter has been brought close together by its power over external nature, that is, by distance-annihilating machines. The coming *Kurukshetra* will leave no loop-hole for the admission of subsequent reinoculation and recorruption such as India was exposed to. There will remain no external barbarian to disturb the new spiritual life. The Indian experiment failed because, it was premature and carried out on a small scale. The new experiment, the coming *Kurukshetra*, has a better chance for stability of results. For good or evil a new dispensation is on its way from heaven. India thinks it is coming for good ; the West thinks it is coming with a dreadful glare. (Read Lloyd George's recent speech at the meeting of the National Liberals).

To conclude, the Collective Self is a soulless self. It has no high moral principles. It is the creation of man to subserve the cosmic process, and to add to the fierceness of the struggle for existence by reinforcing the power of Nature with the power of Art, by adding to the power of bones and muscles the power of gun-powder and gas, by improving upon brute cunning and cruelty by the refinements of strategic treachery and cultivated unscruplousness. It is self-destructive in the long run, poisonous in its life process and destructive in its death ; for though it is eventually followed by the superior life of the spirit, the interregnum is a melancholy period in human history. The suzerainty of the collective self, whether as national, class, professional, racial, or sex self, in the heart of man (of either sex) means the dethronement of the true self, of the image of God in man. It degrades him to the refined brute life of war on the pretext of elevating him to the peace and bliss of the kingdom of God on earth. The collective self is a slave king, a usurper, an upstart, a tyrant, gloriously ignoble and infamously triumphant. Its suzerainty is however a passing phase in the life process of man, a necessary evil in the inscrutable economy of Nature which makes tribulation an inseparable antecedent of triumph, for which Mill condemns Nature as clumsy, cruel, unjust and wasteful, while Huxley thinks it a sufficient explanation to say that she is non-moral, and the Vedanta assumes a moral reverential tone by ascribing the phenomenon to the sportive mood of *Maya*, which the general culture of the West, untouched by Christianity and the Bible, regards as devilish, while Herbert Spencer considers it a

knowable phenomenon indicating the mood in which works the Unknowable Power throughout the universe, admitting thereby that the Latter is known to this extent that He is wasteful in His method, callous in moral sentiments, and therefore imperfect in character, leaving room for a still Higher Being to complete the harmony of our conception of the universe.

THE DISMAL DEVIL'S GLARE IN THE DARK.

How it affects the East and the West.

In this article I intend to deal with the comparative psychology of the East and the West in regard to the problem of population. I make no apology for the quaintness of the title of the essay. The words 'dismal' and 'devil' are borrowed from the writings of two eminent writers of world-fame, who have used them with great effect in calling attention to the same object, whose incessant glare, now dull and again blazing into a flare, keeps western civilization continually watchful, sometimes trembling and now tottering. Among the achievements of science and civilisation, the discovery of the dismal devil ranks as one of the most wonderful. The discovery is more than a hundred years old now, and during this long period scientific investigation has enabled the savants of the civilised world to study the devil, his nativity and growth, his activities and accomplishments, his threats and their fulfilments, with great care and thoroughness. It has now been discovered that it was this devil who by his threats and instigations, his promises and deceptions goaded Europe into the Great War, whose aftermath, slowly developing, is now changing the face of the existing order and creating an unprecedented consternation all over the world. The subject is likely to interest the reader, and I have ventured to shake off my diffidence in order to place before him such facts and inferences as have been available to me.

The feeling of oppression caused by the consciousness of over-population is, according to Hebrew tradition, as old as when the total population of the world consisted of two brothers and their aged parents.* This feeling is known in some countries by the name of jealousy,—a disagreeable name, indicating that there is some screw loose in the machine where thought and feeling are generated. In other countries it is regarded as the foundation of civilisation and human progress, of science and art which make the world worth living. The former countries are in the East, and the latter, in the West. Surely the East and the West began life with a serious psychological gulf placed between them by nature—a gulf which has been deepening and widening with the lapse of time, defying all attempts at constructing a substantial cantilever

bridge, though a weak and fragile pontoon connection has been established between the banks. In the West a man thinks twice before he unites himself with a woman ; and when he has entered into marriage, the intimation that a baby is coming to visit him generates in him a disagreeable feeling, though when the visitor actually comes he does not spare himself to make him comfortable. In the East the birth of a child though hailed with the blowing of trumpet, does not lead to that degree of solicitude for his comforts which is conspicuous in the West. The man of the East does not pay any extraordinary deference or attention to his child, because he does not pay them to himself. Life as lived in this world is not of much consequence to him, and he does not go out of his way to make it a matter of deep concern. In the West this life is a gift of heaven, and is tended with great care. In the East it is a mere contrivance made by a sportive God for his own pleasure. A few million dolls, more or less, do not matter. Famine and pestilence sweep them away, and Rebirth brings them back to take part in the eternal sport again. No man ever dies in this world of sport ; he only goes 'out'. though the youthful players sometimes cry out, "dead, dead," to make the fact more impressive.

The man of the West, particularly if he is equipped with the gift of forethought, tries his best to keep out visitors. He knows that the latter will not add to his income, while his expenditure will increase. To produce a balanced budget he tries, like a genuine statesman, to retrench domestic expenditure, and to add to his fiscal activities. The last process is difficult, and he feels that he must curtail his comforts and luxuries, and probably descend from warm chops and cutlets to cold meat, and probably take bread without a coating of butter, and substitute Nature's drink for artificial beaverage, coarse blanket for serge and broad cloth, and half-tanned skin for soft leather. It means an ordeal to him. The disagreeable feeling has developed for five thousand years, during which, despite all preventive and remedial measures, the world's population has increased eighteen hundred million fold. Humanity bore their suffering, ignorant of the true scientific cause of it until a little over a hundred years ago, Malthus, a Christian Clergyman of England, in his endeavour, probably, to bring about an apologetic reconciliation between science and theology, published the marvellous discovery that while subsistence grew in arithmetical, population advanced in geometrical progression. He discovered this ugly

truth by *a posteriori* research. He probably found in the supernatural implications of the discovery a fulfilment and verification of the curse passed by God, first, on Adam, who was guilty of dire disobedience of his command, and then on his son Cain, who had broken the most important commandment in the decalogue, a thousand years before its promulgation through Moses,—the curse that stiffened Nature to yield no return proportionate to the labour applied to her, to reinforce, as a paraphrastic surplusage, the other curse that man would perpetually eat in the sweat of his face and in the sorrows of his heart, and that he would live as a vagabond and fugutive on earth. Christ was, no doubt, sent after three thousand years to save humanity from their growing distress, but the mission failed, and before leaving the world under the most pathetic circumstances, Christ promised a second visit when the kingdom of God on earth would be firmly established by the final expulsion of Satan and his legion, who had selected this speck of dust for conducting their irritating excursions of pin-pricks and pinches. The second visit has not come yet. Devoted Christians thought during the Great War that Christ was coming, not, as the New Testament predicted, like a thief at dead of night, but with trumpets blowing, bombs firing, zeppelins flying, and submarines plunging, with the earth dug up, and the ocean turned into a huge graveyard. One of them wrote a book to answer the question, "what is coming?" But the aftermath of the war is by no means promising, and meanwhile the devil whom Malthus discovered has increased the fierceness of his glare. The effectiveness of the positive check applied by man in the shape of war has proved considerably short of expectations. Man tries to keep down or to reduce population, while the devil's object is to increase suffering by reducing rations. Instead of slaughtering consumers the war has murdered capital. Labour is crying for employment; parasitism is crying for abundance and cheaper goods, while the remnant of capital is dissipating itself in the poisonous atmosphere of taxation. The world is passing through an ordeal.

The true inwardness of the curse never appears to have been realised in Europe. Some people interpret over-population as an absolute excess destined to immediate extirpation by starvation. There are others who think that the excess is compelled to quit the world, through lack of adequate nutrition, by disease caused by slow enervation. Some are of opinion that a larger population is affected

than the mathematical excess, and actual death is put off for a comparatively long time. There are others who think that the population as a whole is affected, and though death is not hastened, general debility and debauchment ensue with the result that the average efficiency of labour or working capacity is reduced so as to produce permanent national degeneration. These statements are suggestive, and not intended to be exhaustive. Much depends on the meaning of the word 'subsistence' used in the Malthusian law. The law itself as stated by Malthus lacks perspicuity, though generally he seems to include clothing, house-shelter and ordinary comforts in the signification attached to the word. These elements, particularly the last, give a character of vaguenss to the law, and deprive it of much of its value as a scientific truth. To be brief, subsistence may mean provision for the physiological needs of the human constitution, or it may include his aesthetic needs also. These two kinds of needs, including hygienic and sanitary requirements aswell as the finer demands of the nervous system, are themselves variable as a consequence of the inequality which characterises the social organisation. These explanations however touch but the fringe of the difficulty. The real source of confusion in interpreting the law lies elsewhere.

Hygienic experts are divided in opinion as to the quality and quantity of food the average man requires to keep good health. They vary for childhood, youth and old age. They vary also for difference of climate. Food values are a difficult subject to determine from the economic, hygienic and aesthetic point of view. The same difficulty is experienced from the sanitary point of view, *i.e.*, in regard to clothing, house shelter and surroundings. As a rule within certain limits of conditions the average man requires a determinable quantity of food, though it is difficult to determine it. The old opinion, that where the quanitty is unknown it is less injurious to consume a little more of the food than a little less of it, was an indirect invitation to the Malthusian devil. That opinion is now changed among experts. An American expert considers that the average man consumes six times as much food as he requires for normal health. An Indian expert thinks that in India the average consumption of food is eight times as great. When we include aesthetic needs experts are bewildered as to the value of the commodities required for their satisfaction. This value varies more widely than the cost of hygienic satisfactions. Every

man has his own value for every stage of life ; and every station of life has a value of its own. The changing tastes and temperaments of the individual ask for different values from time to time. As a rule the value increases with progress in gratification and the economic capacity of the individual. Time scale salaries in the public service are not an unmixed benefit. They have a demoralising influence on tastes. The institution of old age pensions is excellent, but a man must adapt his temperament to the new conditions of income to reap the full benefit of the institution.

Happiness and contentment are delicate states of consciousness. They change with every puff of wind in the outer atmosphere of objects, and every vibration in the nervous system. The nerve centre is kept in order by physical and psychical forces. The appetites and desires though separable in thought from the objects which soothe them in their excitement, are also stimulated in different degrees by their appearance or disappearance, nearness or remoteness, largeness or smallness. The outer world is interwoven with the inner. The senses are interlaced with one another. The influence of will, instincts, culture, custom, tradition, memory, sensation, perception and consciousness of all kinds is visible in happiness and contentment. Psychology however is in its infancy, and I shall try no analysis. It may be stated, however, as a truth that attachment, detachment and indifference to the objective world may each produce the consciousness of happiness. In the West attachment, and in the East detachment or indifference gives happi ness. The psychologies of the two hemispheres are unlike. Over-population is an objective fact as well as a feeling. In the former capacity it affects the health of the body. In the latter, it affects the health of the mind. Disorder in the mind produces disorder in the body, acting through the nervous system. Over-population as an objective fact is much weaker than as a subjective feeling. No country is objectively over-populated if, as experts tell us, the average man consumes six times as much commodity as good health requires. The West is subjectively over-populated ; the East is not.

It will be seen from what has been said above that the value of the Malthusian law as a mathematical truth is not very great, as one of the terms used in it, namely, subsistence, is incapable of precise definition. It has, however, a general value, which determines the prosperity or impoverishment of families and nations. The law wisely limits itself to tendencies and potentialities, and

does not extend to actual results. Nations which neglect these tendencies, and fail to provide against them run towards ruin. The objeet of Western civilization is to counteract these tendencies by various methods. The misfortune is that the methods are mere temporary and treacherous palliatives with a cumulative tendency towards catastrophic ends. Experience shows that subjective maladies are not easily cured by objective remedies. Lady Macbeth rightly doubted the power of physicians to cure mental diseases.

Every inch of ground actually gained by Western civilization leads potentially to the loss of two inches. The Malthusian law of economies has been rightly described by Professor Keynes as a devil ; and Carlyle long ago described the entire science as the dismal science. The former has made the latter dismal. Over-population is thus a dismal devil ever casting a dreadful glare in the dark at Western civilization. The devil it may be truly said, resides within the heart, and torments it. If the kingdom of God is within man *de jure* or *potentially*, the kingdom of the devil is within him *de facto* or *actually*. The dismal devil holding empire within the heart of man, but supposed to rule as a nonresident foreign tyrant, was discovered by Malthus, not created by him. The devil is older than the curse of Cain. He invaded Human Society in the second generation, at seven o'clock in the morning of human civilization. Civilization began with the expulsion of man from paradise, which immediately followed the eating of the venomous fruit, and the devil marched in shortly after. His glare affected the West more than the East, where people largely escaped it by calmly accepting that part of the curse of Cain which purported to turn man into a vagabond and a fugutive on earth. There, man largely detached himself from life, which he considered unreal and overspread with illusions, while in the West man attached himself to the earth and to life despite the curse, and made matters worse by his otiose strivings. The civilized man of the West has tried various methods to drive out the devil, but has plunged deeper in the mire of misery by accepting temporary palliatives, instead of striking at the vital parts of the enemy's body. I shall here barely mention the methods leaving fuller explanation to develop itself in due course. These methods are :—(1) exploration, (2) expropriation, (3) extermination, (4) expulsion and (9) exploitation, adding only that where the devil stared at the whole population, civilization made compromise by sacrificing part of it.

Over-population may have various gradations of width and expansion. It may be universal, national, communal, domestic or occasional. When at a banquet thirteen men are present while board is laid for twelve there is one too many. That is the simplest case of over-population. One of the visitors must leave the room or be expelled out of it, if the meeting is not to be dissolved abortively. The difficulty lies in selecting the victim or the man to be rejected. What is known as the Law of Natural Selection is a special mode of elimination or rejection leading to selection for preservation. This mode of indirect selection is followed by the Selection Board appointed for selecting candidates for the Imperial Civil and Police Service examinations and for the Bengal Civil Service examination. Those who are not rejected are automatically selected. The selection is passive ; the rejection is active. The selection is a corollary of the rejection. Now imagine the world to be a big banqueting hall, and the total population of the world to be the guests invited by Nature, while Board is laid for a smaller number. This is universal over-population. Nature as the host must reject the excess population. Darwin discovered the unedifying law of passive selection by active rejection, now known as the Law of Natural Selection. Man is supposed to be exclusively responsible for the creation of over-population, and Nature is supposed to merit thanks for bringing population down to normal density. The truth is that man has not yet succeeded in discriminating between Nature and Art separately energising to his final destiny. If Malthus discovered a Captain, Darwin uncovered the head of the Fieldmarshall and Commander-in-Chief of the famous army that contested the sovereignty of heaven with the Almighty. But Darwin's theory has a redeeming feature, which stimulates hope and optimism for humanity as a collective personality. The passive selection is not merely a preservative process, but an ameliorative or developmental force, which, it is anticipated by philosophers like Herbert Spencer, will eventually turn the world not merely into an abode of plenty and prosperity, but perfect the moral life of man into a real kingdom of Heaven, such as Christ came to establish on earth. No doubt that ideal condition is placed in the remote future, separated from the present by millions of years, still it has a fascination for minds accustomed to subordinate the individual to the Society, and not merely reconciled to the consciousness of indefinite, almost eternal human sacrifice in retail, but adjusted to look with a heavenly

complacency on it for the sake of the ultimate blissful state. That there is no salvation without sacrifice is a deep-rooted sentiment in the humanmind. This sentiment in the early ages contemplated voluntary sacrifice and separate salvation for the individual. The sentiment in the present age contemplates compulsory sacrifice of the individual for collective salvation. Under the new scheme the individual lives for the society. Under the old scheme society was established for the benefit of the individual. This distinction is conspicuous in German culture. It is vague and obscure in British culture. Herbert Spencer who for the first time dealt with this aspect of social life was not quite sure whether society was for the benefit of the individual or the individual was for the benefit of Society, and tried to convince people that the two propositions had equal force. The distinction becomes glaring when the interest of Society antagonises with the interest of the individual. His ultimate ideal however seems to show more clearly that he thought of the interests of the individual as definitely subordinate to those of Society; for the individuals of the present generation can have no interest as individuals, in sacrificing themselves for the benefit of other individuals, unknown and unborn, but expected to come into life long after the former have been dead and forgotten. Our primitive forbears found delight in the religion of ancestor worship; our scientific contemporaries are exultant over the worship of posterity. It may be mentioned that the ancestors had a real existence, while posterity has an existence in possibility only. I may add also that subsequent research has established the truth that the interests of Society are in many cases antagonistic to the interests of individuals, and not merely incongruent with them; whence it follows that the individual can not work for the benefit of Society without feeling his own subordination, while Society never has that debasing feeling of self-subordination. At all events Darwin invested the Malthusian devil with divine qualities, however remote and indistinct. He rediscovered the devil and bestowed on him a larger outlook, a larger perspective and a finer morality. Malthus' devil is purely destructive. Darwin's is destructive with a difference.

The pressure of over-population is most conspicuously felt where recurring supply is stopped, and a fixed population has to depend upon a deminishing supply, as in a life-boat or in a besieged garrison. Here the only method of relief lies in the rejection of a part of the population for the mere preservation of the rest. The

method of selection is artificial, often irrational. Sometimes the decision of chance or lottery is depended upon. I am not aware of any instance where a body of people segregated from the rest of the world, and depending upon a diminisging supply of subsistence, have taken the alternative of death for all or for none. The extreme attachment to life brings into operation the law that one life is better than no life, when all lives are in peril. This is the law of the culture of the West. Eastern culture has a different law. It is dominated by a higher consciousness, and 'death for all or no death at all' is the alternative approved by individual conscience and public opinion, though the occasion for such decision is seldom risked. When, however, the risk does arrive, there is no inclination to seek for selection or rejection of parts. The idea of segregation in an epidemic or plague or contagious disease is strenuously opposed by the Eastern conscience, while in the West it is believed to be inspired by higher morality and wisdom, which regards Nature as non-moral, and God, as exulting in selective preference, or in the butchery of rejection. Segregation is a form of expulsion ennobled by the notion that it is suggested by divine wisdom. The eastern mass-mind regards segregation as an unholy and futile interference with divine purpose and process. The law of Natural selection had no chance of being discovered in the East however high the scientific attainments of the people might be. Those who think that the East can with benefit adopt Western Science, and at the same time retain its indigenous moral sentiments, should ponder over these facts with a dispassionate mind. Science is not merely Physics, Mechanics or Chemistry, but it includes other branches of knowledge more directly and intimately concerned with human welfare. Perhaps the advocates of amalgamation would make (1) a selection of the sciences to be taught to school boys and (2) a cross marking of the chapters to be eschewed in the selected books. They would probably assume pontifical authority to decide what exactly is to be taught and what to be rejected. They must in the first instance decide what exactly is to be taught and what to be rejected. They must also decide whether nature is moral or non-moral. Thirdly, they must decide whether Nature has behind her a Super-nature, whose modes are expressed in natural phenomena. Fourthly, they must decide whether this Super-nature, if it exists, is moral, non-moral or immoral or mysterious (*i.e.*, unknowable.) These are fundamental questions and must be definitely and precisely

answered before the East can adopt Western Science, as distinguished from Western civilisation. Western civilisation is fundamentally connected with Western Science, and the Western 'nation' or 'nationalism' is intimately connected with Western Civilisation. Some advocates of amalgamation of East and West erroneously try to dissociate the three social elements, *viz.*, Science, Civilization and Nation from one another, forgetting that all three indicate the existence of a particular social psychology or mode of thinking, or of estimating values, which must be changed before any real amalgamation can take place. The problem here adumbrated is of the highest importance to Humanity though it does not belong to the subject I am dealing with, except indirectly. The particular social psychology of a nation at any given moment or period of history is the resultant of the interaction of two forces—the one internal and the other external. National psychology is never static or stagnant, but a changeful dynamic force, which issues out of the psychology of the next preceding moment or period, perturbed by new events and facts of national importance generating new interests for the nation of a protective or progressive nature, which last are themselves almost inextricably interwoven. For instance, the Great War is ordinarily known to have been caused by an accident at Serajevo in Serbia. But a petty momentary or transitory incident like the accident of Serajevo could never have by itself caused a cataclysm like the Great War. The belligerants or most of them (and these the most important of them) were already psychologically prepared for the war. The new interests which affected German psychology were progressive or aggressive in character ; those which influenced British and French psychology were protective or defensive. The latter were in possession of vested interests which Germany was indirectly disputing by an unprecedented rapidity of commercial and industrial expansion threatening to dislodge them from their position of ascendancy or leadership in Western civilization. The world was too small for the three, while there were springing up in the ColumboDa Gamic world other powers which might sooner or later assume the same self-assertive attitude as Germany. Indeed one of them, namely, the United States of America by her geographical remoteness, her vastness of territory, her stupendous material resources and her avowed colonial policy, had silenced suspicion and kept the psychology of the nations holding vested interests confined within peaceful

bounds. Ten years before the war students of national psychology had predicted it. Three years before the breaking out of war there was no body, who was anybody in the civilised world, who did not foresee that a collision between progressive and protective interests was impending. The responsible rulers on both sides were deliberately engaged in preparing themselves, for about fifteen years, for a war the like of which the world had never seen before. It was a study of national psychology that enabled statesmen and streetsmen to prodict the war and prepare for it.

From these facts it will appear that nothing great in the world happens without a preparatory or premonitory change in social psychology. Social psychology does not change in a day. Germany had taken fifty years to change the main current of her psychology from the ideals of philosophy and poetry to commerce and industry from academic supremacy to political ascendancy; while her military, instincts, strong and promising from the beginning of history, had continued to develop with accelerated speed triumphantly passing through the Franco-German War, until it culminated in the Great War of 1914-18. The French Revolution of 1790 was the result of a change in the psychology of resignation to the inevitable to that of drastic aggression of the possible, effected in the course of half a century by a mixed propaganda, conducted by the encyclopœdists, atheists and revolutionists, preaching the natural rights of men against which vested interest could not plead any law of limitation. Potentiality precedes actuality, and potentiality is another name for change of psychology in social phenomena of an extraordinary character. Before the East can advance upon a scheme for amalgamating her own civilization with that of the West she must take stock of her present psychology and the changes it has undergone during the last fifty years by the pressure of Western Civilization, with its reactions and revivalisms. Amalgamation is a general term comprehending many varieties of union. Lord Ronaldshay would introduce Western Civilisation and culture into India with an Indian orientation. Dr. Tagore would borrow Western Science divorced from Western morals, particularly the morals of the 'nation' of the West. Is it possible to turn the Indian psychology of the life of contemplation and indifference to the objective world to that of attachment and the hurry and bustle of industrial and commercial life; the psychology of complacency and contentment to that of complaint and combativeness; the

psychology of plenty in privation to that of privation in plenty and abundance? The last psychology has largely changed, causing avoidable misery and suffering, while complacency and contentment have glided into imbecile complaint divorced from combativeness. The life of contemplation and indifference is crumbling without any reconstructive effort in the direction of industry and commerce. While it is difficult either to return to the old psychology or to advance in a wholesome direction, it is easy to leave India to the mercy of environment, composed mainly of foreign influences, to glide, along the line of least resistance to the hall of lethargy, love of comfort and incapacity to gratify it. The relevancy of this apparent digression will appear when I come to point out how while the West is frightened by the glare of the dismal devil, the East remains unperturbed. It will be useful even at the risk of the imputation of repetition to call attention to the fundamental fact that overpopulation is a subjective consciousness as well as an objective fact. Ordinarily in the phenomena of perception the subjective consciousness is believed to be a mere ideated reflection of an objective fact acting upon the thinking subject through the medium of one or more of the senses; and mathematically speaking the intensity of the consciousness varies directly as the strength with which the fact impinges upon the thinking subject. The consciousness of over-population does not strictly follow this law. At a given time in a given society a density of 50 to the mile may be regarded as constituting overpopulation. At another time a density of 500 to the mile may be regarded as a sign of underpopulation. Every country has a fixed density for a given period as its normal density. Taking general circumstances into consideration India is badly over-populated in the eye of the European. But the children of the soil are at this moment crying for an increasing population. Some philosophers lament that the Bengalee is a dying race, though the census does not show much diminution of numbers from decade to decade. On the other hand Europe is crying for a diminution of the population as the continent is unable to sustain the existing density left stranded in the aftermath of the Great War. She would fain expel into exile the unemployed people who now number large throughout the continent including Britain. But the actual density in Europe is lower than the density in India. The emotion by which the consciousness of over-population is accompanied often varies in intensity, at least in its outward manifestation, as

experience shows, in inverse order with the strength of the objective fact. Throughout Europe during the fifty years immediately preceding the war, the complaint of over-population in the mentality of the average citizen increased in intensity and loudness in proportion as the law of increasing return asserted itself; as the people were beginning to have more food and clothing and better comforts, after a period of starvation wages and unhealthy conditions of factory labour, while the Ruling classes, following the example of Oliver Twist, cried for still more. Probably, having regard to all the circumstances of the work house management, the poor child was unreasonable and got his reward in the shape of a flogging. The people, particularly the ruling classes of Europe are now undergoing the same kind of suffering. The more they ask for, the fiercer is the glare of the devil and the severer their fright and suffering. News of the hopeless condition of Europe at the present time is coming daily with the accounts of the problem of reparation, the occupation of the Ruhr, the impending dissolu tion of industry in the occupied territory, the moral disintegration evidenced by the separatist movement, the persistence of the stubborn French policy and the dilemma in which Britain finds herself between the horns of Honour and Interest, the collapse of exchange, the disappearance of the Russian granary, the growing atrophy of German industry and trade, and the gradual emaciation of British manufacture and commerce. One can not fail to perceive the dismal devild's glare behind this panoramic scene of desolation, disruption and chaos affecting the mighty civilization that has for more than two centuries kept the world spell-bound. Suppose a similar cataclysm had passed over India. She did not escape her due share of slaughter and economic bleeding of the Great War. But has she suffered much mental agony thereby? Her psychology is different. The million soldiers that she sent to the field of carnage went for the most part never to return home. The trade conditions sent up the prices of food and clothing three hundred per cent. high. But what did India do? She shed not a drop of tear. She struggled not to improve her material condition. Her people went on propagating the race as before, and pestilence persisted in her course of killing and weakening as before. She has nearly got through the ordeal without losing her equanimity. She fasted half the days and went half-naked for a negligible period of six or seven years. The revenue of the Government of India showed a slight temporary

set back, and new forms of taxation filled the treasury again. India hardly felt the blast, and if she stood up to bow before it, she is again plunged in the deepest thought. To change her condition is to change her psychology, her mental nature and her outlook on life. To change her psychology is to subject her to frights and scares caused by the glare of the dismal devil ; to subect her to the miseries of over-population in the midst of abundance, to consternation in the midst of heavenly anticipations of a better time for the world. Psychology, Mentality, Culture and Nature nearly express the same idea. To change the psychology of a people is to change their mentality, their nature and their culture. When Spencer says the nature of the Englishman is different from that of the Indian, he obviously means something that changes, though not very quickly yet not very slowly ;— he calls attention to the divergent culture of the West and the East. We may substitute mentality for culture if we like, without altering the sense. Slave-mentality, slave-psychology, slave-culture and slave-nature give nearly the same idea. The time taken to produce any change in any of the four ideas has a minimum which varies with environment. But in no case can a people change their mentality or their nature in less than two generations, however hard and persistent the propaganda work may be. I call attention to this truth because there exists in the world of philosopher-reformers a strong tendency to press the years into hours in their regenerative desires. Herbert Spencer, the author of the Synthetic Philosophy, who had unfortunately written articles on the functions of the State as a reforming propagandist, suffered from the illusion that the socialistic movement which he denounced would collapse before his death, or in other words that the psychology or nature or mentality of the British people which had taken a decided turn towards socialism would again run into a firm individualistic steel-frame and there keep itself fixed till the kingdom of plenty arrived, and perfect altruism untouched by emotion turned it into the kingdom of God on earth. It pained him to observe from year to year that the socialistic movement far from collapsing was gaining additional strength and expansion. Mr. Hudson consoled him in his death-bed at Brighton by telling him that socialism was decaying ; and the dying man involuntarily exclaimed, "I am satisfied, I am satisfied."

Something of the same kind of mentality was observed in the great philosopher-poet-reformer of India, (a delicious concoction

of tamarind, chilli and sugar which titillates the palatal nerves and afterwards irritates the pectoral muscles) who after entering into a solemn contract with Slumbering Nemesis for the strangulation of the British "nation" of the West, without desecrating, with her untouchable hands, the sacred civilisation of that hemisphere, had hurried from Europe and America in 1921 to take part in the Non-Co-operation movement, by which Mahatma Gandhi, as he had been informed by his correspondents, had, as by a sudden coup changed the slave-mentality of India into a psychology of independence and fearlessness, of orderly progress in moral and social idealism. He was sadly disappointed, and before long he had to confees his mistake at a public meeting.

THE DISMAL DEVIL'S GLARE IN THE DARK—II,

THE POPULATION PROBLEM.

Outline of its History.

Before entering upon a discussion of the scheme designed and executed by man for the purpose of evading the Devil's Glare I shall take a bird's eye view of the history of the truth, now known all over the world as the Law of Malthus. The sub-conscious and therefore unacknowledged indebtedness of the latter to the ancient wisdom of semetic culture will appear from the following quotations from the Book of Genesis, which form the foundation primarily of the religion of the Jews, and secondarily of Christanity, the religion of the civilized races of modern times :

Chapter 3. 16. Unto the woman (Eve) He said, "I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and the conception ; in sorrow shalt thou bring forth children ; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shal rule over thee."

Chapter 3. 19. "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground."

Chapter 3. 23. Therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden to till the ground from whence he was taken.

Chapter 4. 12. "When thou tillest the ground it shall not henceforth yield unto thee her strength : a fugutive and a vagabond shalt thou be in the Earth".

These truths have been fully verified by human experience. The economic life or three-fourths of the total life of man is directly related to the curses passed by God upon Eve, Adam and Cain. The curse regarding the growth of population was addressed to Eve in a most impressive manner though not given as a morsel of algebra. That relating to the difficulty of successful agriculture formulates in a rudimentary fashion the law of diminishing return in agricultural industry. Through Adam God announced to mankind that hard work and misery were to be their lot.

The laws of production and reproduction and their relation, and of diminishing returns lie hidden within the curses. The Malthusian law is a restatement of these curses, changed in form, and finical in appearance, and provided with a civilized tailored garment in place of the primitive fig leaf apron, devised by the phisolophers of the ancient Hebrew world. No writer on economics has so far called attention to them, because no body outside the Christian world has seriously handled economic problems ; and a Christian writer would probably feel the sensation of a hot potato in handling them. During the five thousand years that elapsed between Cain and Malthus man had left no stone unturned, though in a subconscious way, to evade the curses, and had uniformly failed. Indeed, the economic history of man from the beginning down to the present time is the history of the failure of successive schemes designed to make the curses nugatory for the whole or a portion of mankind.

The form of economic production that the primitive man adopted was of the communistic type. During the pastoral period all cattle were common property. The women were prolific, and population soon outgrew subsistence. Nomadism, calculated to check the growth of the birth rate in excess of the death rate among infants, and to find good scope for the growth of the herds of cattle, was tried tentatively, till all the pastures of the world were exhausted. Then came the age of communistic agriculture.

This also failed because the conception of woman segregated in comparative idleness in the homes was greatly multiplied. Man next tried the individualistic form of social organization. The

foundation of the scheme was extremely wicked. It embodies the principle sometimes boldly formulated as 'every man for himself, and the Devil take the hindmost'. It seems as if men in some undefined stage of history argued thus :—"We have all tried to eat bread without sweat, and have failed ; let us now try as a tentative scheme, to allow half the men to eat bread in joy, while the perspiration on the brows of the other moiety is doubled, so as to keep the total quantity of sweat unchanged." It was implicitly agreed that individuals of the wet group would be free to push themselves up into the dry group, putting down in the process an equal number from the latter. The total population went on increasing, that of the second group more copiously than the population of the first, until it was found that the second group comprised ninety per cent. of the total population. It was found also that gravitation was a stronger force than capillarity : Men more largely fell from the upper plane than they rose from the lower. Discontent made its appearance among those who fell, and the society lost peace. This border land of discontent is called the bourgeoisie or the middle class. Poison filtered down from this class into the sweated proletariat, and now anarchy, though in thought more than in action, is the prevailing condition of society ; and of late the scheme of life, known under the general name of socialism, has been slowly pushing its way like a wedge into the individualistic scheme of social organization. In some countries order has been so far preserved by compromises, and in one or two the old communism has been revived in a form suited to new environment. The world-tendency as a whole is decidedly towards equality of perspiration in the eating of bread.

Malthus makes no mention of the curses which constitute the key stones of the truth discovered by him, though he was a Churchman, and had good reason to know them. Faith in the Bible had already been weakened by Science, and the advocates of the religion had assumed an apologetic tone in cultured society. Instead of the Bible being used in judging the value of other books, new thoughts were used in judging the value of the thoughts contained in the Bible, which were interpreted in different ways by different advocates. In the new light the curses seemed to represent God as a being made in the image of man, and that too not of the best type. They showed that he had strong passions and a weak intellect. So the curses were not much thought of in the Christian

world ; and the Malthusian law came to be regarded in course of time not as a law of God, but as a reality that had emerged out of the wicked brain of the Devil. It is thus that Professor Keynes more than a century after, came to think that Malthus had disclosed a Devil. Indeed a God that can curse his creatures in the way indicated in the Malthusian law cannot honesty be regarded as good ; and belief at present in the civilized world has become too pragmatic to make much discrimination between God and the Devil. Yet there are cultured Christians who seem to feel plunged in a swamp of loathsome thought when they are told by a Hindu that creation is a sport of Mahamaya, who creates and kills at pleasure, and creates and kills again presenting a panoramic procession of births and deaths, joys and sorrows, music and noise, good and evil, truth and untruth, belief and scepticism, order and chaos, evolution and revolution, individualism and socialism, justice and injustice, war and peace, oppression and vindication, triumph and defeat etc.

Malthus published his book in 1798 inspired by the call of Truth which felt disgusted by the stream of wild optimism welling out of the marvellous enterprizes of the creative impulse brought into life by the steam engine and the mechanical revolution of recent years, supplementing in the triumphant adventurer, all over the world, the possessive impulse of Western Europe, and specially of England,—disgusted by the monstrous Himalayan hopes of paradise built upon the products of grinding super-added to those of grubbing. Man had begun to hope that the kingdom of God on earth was in sight, and that the entire civilized world would be turned into a garden, where gratifications would come ere wants were felt, by the direct exploitation of nature, added to the exploitation of uncivilized neighbour, whose claim to take rank as man was not yet definitely recognised. Godwin and Condorect were the leaders of this optimism. Condorcet was so far maddened by illusion and hallucination that he had actually the temerity to record the opinion that death would leave mankind afraid of the art of medicine equipped with the power of indefinitely elongating life. Malthus by publishing his law of arithmetical and geometrical progression, applied to the growth of subsistence and population respectively, threw a snow-wet blanket upon these wild, hot aspirations. The essay on population was at once denounced as unholy, as atheistic, as subversive of social order ; and Malthus himself was denounced as anti-Christ, immoral, revolutionary, hard-hearted and cruel·

It is strange Malthus does not appear to have thought of defending himself with the weapons placed at his disposal by the Book of Genesis. The essay, however, received appreciation from men in influential quarters, and soon commanded genuine intellectual respect. Professor Keynes writing in 1920 A. D. speaks of the flux of opinion thus :—

"Before the eighteenth century mankind entertained no false (millennial) hopes. To lay the illusions which grew popular at that age's latter end, Malthus disclosed a Devil. For half a century all serious economical writings held that Devil in clear prospect. For the next half century (when the law of increasing return was temporarily asserting itself) he was chained up and out of sight. Now perhaps we have loosed him again."

The Professor might have said that Malthus disclosed God in incomprehensible wrath, not a Devil wallowing in his wealth of wickedness.

The Napoleonic wars had diverted capital to unproductive purposes for a time and had in a general way made it shy with the consequence that wealth did not increase at a satisfactory rate of progress. And afterwards, mismanagement, (political and industrial) Nature's caprices and other causes brought distress to the people of England in sufficient magnitude to make the evanescent enthusiasm of wild anticipations slowly wake and take a pessimistic turn, and this enabled the popularity of the Malthusian law to spread over the civilized world. New economic conditions appeared in Europe about the time of the Franco-German war, as the result of new exploitations among the weak races, and reckless utilization of the depressed classes, turning the tide of popular opinion, which began to cast doubt on the Malthusian law by indicating that it was within the power of man to make subsistence grow faster than population, and that it was not necessary for individual or national prosperity that any moral restraint should be imposed upon the growth of population. The age of the law of increasing return was come. Population grew fast, and subsistence grew faster for thirty years in Europe. But this notion of the coming millennium and of the discomfiture of the advocates of the Malthusian law was disfigured by two inhuman errors : (1) It failed to take note that the law of increasing return in Europe was counterbalanced by the law of diminishing return in Asia and elsewhere where the new

exploitation was carried on, and (2) it failed to take account of the fact that foreign exploitation was a game in which more than one could take part. England and France had been peacefully carrying on this exploitation, but now appeared a terrible competitor, a Himalayan Monster, on the gladiatorial amphitheatre. Germany in her new imperial vigour, utilizing the indemnity of two hundred million sterling received from France, entered into competition with England and France. France was left behind by a few leaps and jumps in a semi-final contest leaving the game for England and Germany to complete. Population rose in both the countries along with increasing prosperity enabling them to fill the barracks with the surplus of the factories. Preparation for war can never lead to peace and War came at last, and ended by dividing the population of Europe—between the dead and the dying.

The following extract from Professor Keynes' *Economic consequences of Peace* will repay perusal as indicating the cleverly prolonged trick of the Dismal Devil preparing the world for the great catastrophe :—

"After 1870 there was developed on a large scale an unprecedented situation, and the economic condition of Europe became for the next fifty years unstable and peculiar. The pressure of population on food which had already been balanced by the accessibility of supplies from America, became for the first time in recorded history definitely reversed. As numbers increased food was actually easier to secure. Large proportional returns from an increasing scale of production became true of agriculture as well as of industry. With the growth of the European population there were more emigrants on the one hand to till the soil of the new countries, and on the other more workmen were available in Europe to prepare the industrial products and capital goods which were to maintain the emigrant populations in their new homes, and to build the railways and ships which were to make accessible to Europe food and raw products from distant sources. Upto about 1900 a unit of labour applied to industry yielded year by year a purchasing power over an increasing quantity of food. It is possible that about the year 1900 this process began to be reversed, and a diminishing yield of Nature to man's effort was beginning to reassert itself...... In this economic Eldorado, in this economic Utopia, most of us were brought up."

It will appear that for thirty years (1870 to 1900) the Dismal Devil in Europe had failed to overtake the growth of subsistence, as if we were too old and fatigued to keep pace with God, who had given a geometrical progression to the growth of subsistence, while the devil had slowed down to arithmetical progression in the growth of consumers. The old insane optimism of the last quarter of the Eighteenth century was revived on a larger scale, and people had begun to think that the order of growth had been permanently reversed ; and Malthus began to lose respect in the world of Economic literature. It seemed as if the world had suddenly expanded, and was at the same time "yielding unto man her strength when he tilled the soil." It appeared as if man would soon cease to be a "fugitive and a vagabond" in the earth, and become the absolute ruler of the world, living in the highest prosperity and joy, instead of eating bread in the sweat of his face. Down came the crash of War in 1914 like the all destructive wrath that John, the baptist, predicted as the purifying process to prepare for the advent of Christ,— and man felt he had been tempted by the devil into an abysmal catastrophe. It now appears that civilized man mistook hectic flush on his face for good health, while the deceitful friendly glare of the devil was consuming the vital forces of his moral life.

The Malthusian law is an algebraical formula comprising two simple propositions, namely, that subsistence varies arithmetically and that population varies geometrically. The variation in both cases are either upward or downward. The mathematical exactitude is of course unreal ; and it may be affirmed in general terms that the wisdom of the modern economic mind does not represent much of an advance upon the wisdom of Hebrew philosophers, who enunciated the law in the form of curses passed by the Regulator of the Universe upon mankind. It is therefore marvellous that no writer on Economics has so far called attention to the curses mentioned in the Bible as the corner stones of philosophic thought on the subject. The reason seems to be that economic thought has developed most in the Christian world, and the curses seem to obliterate the distinction between God and the devil. It is a sort of intellectual cowardice that has made Christian Economists keep quiet over the curses. The boldness of the Hindu is conspicuous in the domain of thought, and he is not afraid of ascribing to *Mahamaya* what appears to be monstrous in the eye of the worshipper of a personal god, supposed to have created man in his own

intellectual and emotional and volitional image. The truth seems to be that the god of Christianity is himself created by man in the latter's image.

No Economic writer has so far drawn attention to the implication of the law that in a decaying society while subsistence decreases in arithmetical ratio, population decreases in geometrical ratio. Thus it would appear that in a decaying society the people live in increasing plenty and prosperity, as individuals, though not collectively as a nation, and that the population may finally die out leaving a large balance of commodities ready for consumption. Some countries have actually discouraged population, and welcomed decay for the sake of abundance and superfluity. France is supposed to have undergone this sort of decay for a long time. But the course of the great war seems to point to the conclusion that decay in western civilization, after all, is not worse than progress. France has undoubtedly shewn most muscular and intellectual power in the war among the allies. Foch has been declared to be the greatest general, and Clemenceau is unrivalled in diplomacy.

The two preceding paragraphs show, (1) that it is difficult to distinguish between god and the devil in the Christian religion, and (2) that it is difficult to state whether decay or growth is the more desirable process in Western civilization.

There is another question which deserves consideration in discriminating between pessimism and optimism. Suppose the law were that while subsistence increases in geometrical progression population increases in arithmetical progression. This law, if real, would apparently speak very favourably of god's solicitude for human progress. Every man would have more than enough for his consumption in the second or third generation, and by the time the fifth generation came into the world, there would be a surplussage of the good things of life which the people would find it difficult to dispose of. They would find it an encumbrance and a clog. The commodities would begin to rot and to poison the atmosphere—the moral atmosphere even more than the physical. This is what actually took place in Europe during the thirty years from 1870 to 1900 A.D. The moral atmosphere was poisoned before surplus commodities began to rot and pine for consumers. Jealousy, intrigue, tariff disputes, meddlesomeness, desire for ascendancy, the

debasement of human aspirations, the desire for muddling and bungling, quickly replaced the ethical by the cosmic modes of mentality and eventually relieved the continent of Europe of her bloated plethora of wealth and her vigorous buoyancy of heart. Half the iron of the world was drowned in the Atlantic, and the steel frame for administrative and other structures has become too costly.

It will appear from the above adumbration that neither prosperity nor poverty, neither the growth of subsistence beyond population, nor the growth of population beyond subsistence, touches the roots of human life, nor determines its ultimate or real purpose and mission. At present philosophic opinion in the Western world, perplexed by futility of correlatives in opposition has been veering towards the notion that there is no ultimate purpose of life, and if any such exists man, in his present condition, has nothing to do with it, his duty being to live from moment to moment in the way most agreeable to it, gathering new and shaking off old experience, and perpetually changing from one state to another, maintaining only a small residuary identity, which itself is liable to be overturned in the long run. He lives and ought to live very much like the creatures of the animal world, subject to evolution, whose activities are not influenced by the thought of heaven and hell, happiness and misery, ultimate perfection or complete corruption, and to whom ideals are unreal. The pragmatic theory of life has no dread of the glare of the Dismal Devil ; but it is different from the Hindu's theory of life and truth. It advocates a kind of dynamic existence whose ultimate object is to breathe in the maximum quantity of oxygen and to breathe out the maximum quantity of carbon dioxide. Life is a perpetual process of consumption and conservation of energy. Life in the Western world is steadily running in this direction, making a new experiment in human experience.

The history of the Malthusian law would be incomplete without a reference to the discovery of the law of the natural selection, which sprang out of it, and has now overspread the world of ethics, sociology, politics and every other branch of science and philosophy. Indeed the value of the Malthusian law now lies perhaps in the fact that without it the law of natural selection might not have seen the light of day. Darwin himself acknowledged his obligation to Malthus unreservedly, and the advocates of his theory of evolution following his lead acknowledge it freely. But there is a fundamental

difference between the two theories. Malthus by assuming the law of self-assertion, as a permanent unalterable fact of life, merely pointed to the struggle for existence without indicating either its exact nature and scope or its ultimate issue. In Darwin's theory the ultimate issue is the essential phenomenon, and the struggle a mere mode of its operation. The issue however is not founded upon reasoned purpose, but follows as a natural effect brought about by a natural cause. Final causes are outside the scope of the theory. In both the theories the struggle is caused by insufficiency of subsistence. In Darwin's theory this insufficiency is limited to subsistence provided ready-made by Nature. In Malthus's law this insufficiency is such that the effort of man cannot change it into sufficiency, except for a very short time. Spencer's utopia suggests that human perfection will consummate itself in superabundance of production and fairness of distribution, implying a drastic change in ethical psychology in man. It is doubtful whether Darwin originally had any intention of extending the application of his law to advanced humanity, equipped with prevision and a moral natrue, which antagonises the unqualified self-assertion of cosmic life. But subsequently he was encouraged by the support of his followers to include man within the scope of his law. His true friend and supporter Mr. Huxley continued to the last to maintain that in proportion as man advances in civilization he transcends the power of the law of natural selection, and becomes free from its operation. The Darwinian theory however has such a charm that no philosopher, social, political or economical, feels pleased with his work until he is able to demonstrate that progress has always been due to the force of natural selection though the method of its operation is still not clearly discernible. The real question seems to be this :— If Darwin's hypothesis is true, at what stage of biological progress does it cease to be operative, and at what stage does it begin to decline in vigour and creative influence. In plainer language the question seems to be at what stage of progress does life begin to relax in self-assertiveness, and at what stage self-assertion terminates altogether. Self-assertiveness has ups and downs in the progress of society, and group-self-assertiveness, though stronger than individual self-assertiveness, marks the advance of Western civilization by its development, and not by its decline. This has added new strength to the Darwinian theory which tries to include within its scope the problem of natural progress as a thing apart from the

progress of the individual. The most advanced nation may thus comprise the least morally advanced individuals. The antagonism between the moral progress of man and the civilization of the nation is steadily casting the former into the shade of neglect and is creating a new order of life in which civilization is largely leavened with barbarism. The theory of natural selection, however powerful in moulding national character, remains open to the serious criticism that its terms admit of no precise definition. It makes survival the test of fitness, and fitness the cause of survival. It whirls in the vicious circle of Logic, and spectators who look on the whirl suffer from what may be called a whirling belief.

KINDS OF OVER-POPULATION.

Over-population may affect a family, a profession, a class or caste, a nation or the world. Every gentleman who has more than two sons feels the pressure of over-population in an individualistic society, for subsistence means comforts and commodities, required for consumption, which vary in quality and quantity suitable for the standard of living adopted by him. He feels that he cannot earn enough to enable him to educate his children properly and to settle them in life suitably. Further, he is depressed by the idea that he cannot leave to each of his sons the same competence that he himself enjoyed, while he feels that each of them is bone of his bones and flesh of his flesh. Every aristocrat or plutocrat who has more than one son has an over-populated family. In his case subsistence includes costly luxuries, which cannot be dispensed with without causing anguish. Every king that has more than one son suffers the sorrows of over-population. There was a time when kings used to make war because they wanted new territories for their sons. Shah Jahan the richest Emperor of India suffered most from the effects of family overpopulation, and was compelled to spend the last years of his life in prison. Imperialism in modern times is prompted by the desire to obtain adequate subsistence for the entire population of a country, suffering from the corroding effects of over-population. There was a time when it was suggested by the desire to provide for the military aristocracy of a country. Further back Emperors wanted imperial expansion to provide for their sons. The world being too small in area, subtle and sordid forms

of imperialism are being invented by civilized cerebration in the shape of railway and mining concessions and other forms of commercial exploitation.

A labourer need not feel the pressure of domestic over-population with a dozen children. If he cannot find ample subsistence for them by his own labour he asks his wife to lighten his burden, and if the labours of both fail to bring adequate income for the family's consumption the more grown up among the children can join them in the factories instead of wasting their time on the streets, and learning much that is bad. Over-population in the poorest classes is the corner-stone of national prosperity. It cheapens both national production and national protection. It keeps down the wages-fund as well as the Military budget. These classes form, not the back-bone of society, but the stick on which it is supported in its inffrmity. Plainly speaking they do not form part of the nation, specially in peace times. If national prosperity includes the prosperity of the labouring population then I think the judgment of historians and social phisosophers regarding the condition of nations at different periods of history will call for much emendation. The labouring classes form the second group in the unequal compact made for frustrating the curse of God, the first group being exempted from the process of perspiration which attends the eating of bread. The industrial and military welfare of a country goes on merrily so long as the labouring classes are successfully kept from the social poison of self-consciousness. That poison has now overspread the entire western world, and is being exported in large barrels to other parts of the world in the name of humanity and the natural rights of man.

This poison ensures the premature death of young industries in countries trying to acquire national prosperity and civilization on Western lines, and either destroys or introduces drastic changes in the character of established civilizations. It steadily tends unperceived to easternize the West—to change her institutions, traditions and customs her very psychology and culture.

Over-population in the professional classes is the seed plot for the cultivation, growth and diffusion of anarchy. The children of Sambo and Quimbo are a treacherous and dangerous tribe. They have a plebeian origin while they enjoy a patrician life. Sons of labourers they live as clerks and overseers and when unemployment

comes they become the leaders of strikes working from behind the screen. They cruelly exact work from workers in peace times, and when disorder comes they desert over to them, instil self-consciousness into them, and incite them to sabotage and anarchy. Every state ought to beware of this class. They are not the back-bone of society, but the bac*k*-breakers of it. They are good bolsheviks and bad citizens. Advocates of inequality in times of peace, they preach the doctrine of equality in times of disorder.

The outlook as described above is rapidly changing on the surface, but the essential principles of the social order remain unaffected by reforms and innovations, and are bound to remain unaltered so long as man does not understand his real mission and destiny as a thinking being, and not merely as a living being, guided by impulse and passion too strong and head-strong to consult reason—so long as he is unable to live in the future with as much facility and felicity as he commands in the present.

In India the caste-system started in life with the unreasonable postulate that the population of each caste would indefinitely maintain a definite ratio of growth. At present that ratio having been disturbed the system is doomed. The system is in a ramshackle condition showing cracks and crannies all over, except in certain structures connected with intermarriage. The fact is, foreign contact has changed the ratio of growth, and the old principles of division of functions and occupations have become extremely fluid. The sight of a brahmin no longer reminds one of sacerdotal functions, nor does the meeting with a sudra put one in expectation of having a new menial for one's household. A *Shah* is not necessarily a shopkeeper nor a Kayestha a clerk. The whole system has been thrown into confusion, and the rigidity of the prohibition of intermarriage, itself an excrescential outgrowth, alone keeps alive the distinction between caste and caste. The system has ceased to be beneficial in any respect, and is steadily showing its maleficent consequences in the shape of national degeneration. Its old unifying influence has been converted into a principle of disunion, and caste-self-consciousness is fast disorganizing the incompletely organized society. The principles of both rights (adhikar) and responsibilities (dayittva) are crumbling in pieces. The old order of precedence has changed into a new order based upon the possession of wealth, and pride alone props up the system.

Several castes have all but disappeared, while others have developed amazingly. The growth of the sweeper and scavenger caste, pushed forward by municipal needs has been marvellous. Town life with all its concomitant implications could hardly have developed without this growth.

OVER-POPULATION OF THE WORLD.

The Malthusian law is not understood in the world outside that part of it where Western civilization forms the moral basis of life. In China and India people seldom care to inquire if there exists for a country a normal density of population, or how its deviations or fluctuations affect the welfare of the people. Yet about half the population of the world are congregated in these two countries. Labour is unorganized, industry is diffused, and unemployment goes unnoticed, because idleness is the normal condition of life, and work, the exception. The standard of living is low, and the climate is favourable, while the moral and religious teachings of the ancient sages have created a culture of indifference and inhibition, unfavourable to the gratification of impulses and appetites, and to the creation of new wants and desires. Births and deaths moving out of their normal dimensions, create neither hope nor fear ; and famine and pestilence are forgotten, like stray man-eaters, as soon as as they have left the neighbourhood. The moral code abounds more with prohibitions and omissions than with positive commands leading to action. The zest of animalism is at its lowest ebb. The fields are cultivated neither better nor worse in the year following an epidemic than in the one preceding it. Life is conserved as a potential force, free from the troubles of consumption and reproduction.

A country like India is difficult to govern not because the people are discontented or disaffected, but because their capacity for discontent and disaffection towards the existing order is never far from the zero point. Good government and bad government are not much discriminated, because good and evil are not yet satisfactorily defined by theology or philosophy for purposes of the mass-life. The general psychology is that whatever is, or whatever happens, is good, either immediately or remotely ; and as there is an almost uniform conflict between immediate good and remote

good, and further, as remote good is more permanent, and, therefore, more desirable than immediate benefit, evil, though never deliberately courted, does not create much internal perturbation.

The British government working for two hundred years has gradually changed this psychology of soporiferous serenity of rationalism, and people have now come to learn that eating two meals is better than eating one, that wearing two sets of clothes is better than having one, that an umbrella is useful in sum and rain, and that a pair of shoes is not only comfortable but gentlemanlike, and that the ideal of human life consists in eating cake instead of bread, on which God has fixed a heavy price in the shape of sweat on the face. Maximum comfort with the minimum exertion is the motto of life.

The government had great difficulty in making the people taxable, and was forced to resort to the salt tax which is a universally acknowledged abomination of civilized rule. Progress has been rapid and government is now in a position to dispense with this primitive form of taxation, though it is retained for historical continuity of administration.

In Africa exploiting explorers found the people naked and wholly un-indebted to Manchester, living on roots and fruits, and were puzzled how they could be made to work for wages. They at length decided on levying a tax on huts, and this proved successful. The people worked in the plantations, received wages, paid the hut tax, and spent the savings on imported goods. Economically their condition remained unaltered, for the time being, income and expenditure presenting a balanced budget. But there was a clear moral gain in the shape of new wants, desires and appetites, and of a capacity for work partially to minister to them. There was no archaic philosophy to teach them the value of inhibition. Civilization developed quickly, and the people once drilled into the groove of progress lost the sense of beauty in free-mentality as well as their arcadian simplicity. They became irredeemable slaves of comfort and staunch advocates of western civilization.

The great question in dealing with such people, mere rotting energy of human muscles—is, how to bring them under the civilizing influence of over-population. The subjective consciousness of over population must precede its actual objective pressure. This has

been the process of civilization all over the heathen world. God's curse was passed for the benefit of entire humanity, and the dismal devil's glare came in time to complete the fulfilment of the curse. The deity and the devil have put their shoulders together to the common task.

The periodical administration reports, in India, show the moral and material progress of the people in terms of the degree of over-population attained, the rate at which the animal appetites have increased, and the gratification secured, of the number of marriages effected and of the borrowing capacity of the reckless masses, of the number of babies born and left surviving, of the quantity of foreign finished goods imported, and of raw materials exported, of the amount of stamp duty paid, and the quantity of intoxicants and sedatives consumed, of the measure of fierceness in the struggle for existence, and of the development of new coloured jealousies, and of the substitution of crooked hate for simple indifference or straightforward love in the relations of neighbours.

Civilization in the West thrives most by its corruption in the East, where over-population is artificially stimulated with the object of cheapening labour, and of making it everywhere and always available. Labour is an exportable commodity and can be shipped across the oceans to places where it can find a good market, and when by dumping the market is overstocked and the dry rot of politics sets in, it can be reshipped to the port of Embarkation after a lapse of five or six generations. The beauty of the thing lies in the fact that the civilized exploiters are not primarily actuated by any desire to injure the savage or semi-savage populations of the world. Their object is to bring to the service of man the unused natural resources of the new countries, but they find it im-impossible to utilize these inorganic materials without cultivating the organic resources which are running into waste throughout them. For several centuries the civilized people held interoceanic commerce in the commodity of labour which grew wild in the swamps and forests of Africa. In India they are producing the commodity by refined, sometimes intensive cultivation, which in the absence of a recognized term may be called homi-culture. India is getting poorer in wealth and richer in labour. South and East Africa, West India Islands, New Zealand and Fiji, British Guiana and Mauritius and a lot of other places are copiously supplied with

labour with the product obtained by cultivation in India. Efforts are now being made to keep it for home consumption, where capitalists from abroad are expected to arrive to make India a gloriously industrial country. These are some of the methods in which over-population in the uncivilized world is developed and exploited for the purpose of promoting the cause of civilization. If we look a little carefully into the process we shall find that the occasional operation of the law of increasing return in the civilized countries is the obverse face of a simultaneous assertion, in an intense form, of the law of diminishing return in the outside world. For the world as a whole the law of increasing return seems to be a trick of the dismal devil—a tantalizing illusion for invigorating the possessive passion in the civilized mind without causing a feeling of compunction to stand in the way of exploitation among the helpless races of the semi-civilized world. It is a trick to convince those who wish to evade God's curses, by limiting the sudoriferous process to the faces of half the people of the world, that they are mere myths and need not influence practical instincts and beneficial impulses.

NATIONAL OVER-POPULATION.

I have briefly adverted to several kinds of over-population, *viz.*, over-population in a family, in a class or caste, and in the world as a whole. But when we speak of over-population without any qualifying term we generally have in mind national over-population, that is, over-population in a compact society with its own traditions and customs, and distinguished by a culture peculiar to the people living in it, and ruled by an authority supposed to be capable of regulating the density of population, not merely as a whole, but in its separate parts and strata. Such regulation will be guided by principles calculated to secure the greatest prosperity for the nation. The government that can so regulate population as to secure the greatest contentment and happiness for the people, and the greatest strength for the nation with the prospect of stability in both directions will be justly regarded as the best government. Such a government, however, has never existed in the world and is not likely to exist so long as man remains morally and intellectually as imperfect as he is now. The regulation of population is a complicated art which no human institution can command, either on account of the undue interference with personal liberty which it

involves, or on account of the fluctuating demand for population caused by ill-regulated international relations and ambitions which now call for a larger and again for a smaller population. Under ordinary circumstances the conflict between the external and internal needs, between national and political interests, between military and industrial requirements keeps the government in a confused state of indecision, leading to *laissez faire* as the safest policy. *Laissez faire* is dependence upon Nature as opposed to Art. When Nature shows a tendency to lead the country to ruin the Government sometimes shake off their superstitious policy or the policy of ignorance, and adopt measures calculated either to increase or to decrease population. When war is expected an increasing population becomes a necessity. When trade is depressed a decreasing population is desired to restore equilibrium between population and subsistence. The relations between capital and labour automactically tend to regulate population according to the country's needs. State action shows itself at its best when it moves with the natural current of tendencies. In countries in which industry is organised over-population manifests itself in unemployment. Unemployment is like the mercury in a barometer, indicating normal or cyclonic social conditions.

Broadly speaking national over-population mainly implies over-population in the labouring classes, which are now virtually castes in the social organism ; for the flow of population from one class to another is, inspite of progress in civilization, perceptibly decreasing in rapidity ; for though human rights are steadily moving towards a common level, opportunities for the fructification of capacity and self-expression in practical life are diminishing. Population in the higher castes, where forethought is common, is all but fixed. The national nursery for the cultivation of population is in the lowest class or caste, and state action is chiefly directed towards this class when measures for increasing or decreasing the national population become necessary.

THE DISMAL DEVIL'S GLARE IN THE DARK—III.

ELUCIDATION OF THE CURSE OF ADAM.

The Curse of Adam stands recorded in the Book of Genesis thus :—"Thou Shalt Eat bread in the sweat of thy face". The curse does not mean that the process of eating or consuming bread is accompanied by sweating. On the other hand, as experience shows, the process of eating is a pleasant fact ; and is more calculated to dry up drops of sweat if they are already in the face. Eating implies producing. "The curse implies that to eat bread a man must produce it, that is, he that eats bread produces it, or, conversely, that he that produces bread eats it ; he is at least entitled to eat it. Negatively, no man should eat bread without producing it. Here lies the foundation of socialism.

The next point is, did God intend the curse to be hereditary? It is generally understood and believed that He did so intend. The law of heredity shows that the offspring inherits the evil as well as the good in the nature of the progenitor. Biological Science has confirmed this primitive interpretation and belief.

In the third place, the curse implies that there is a constant ratio between the quantity of bread eaten and the quantity of sweat shed through the pores of the skin, and as eating is identified with producing, the curse implies the law of constant ratio between the value of the commodity produced and the cost of producing it. The curse of Cain made the curse of Adam more severe by ordaining that the ratio between production and its cost was variable and that if a unit of labour produces a unit of commodity two units of labour will not produce two units of commodity but less— This is the law of 'diminishing return.'

The curse did not indicate what quantity of bread each man should eat, and whether to obtain relief from excessive perspiration a man might reduce his consumption of bread without detriment to his health. It has been believed for long ages, and it is still believed by most people that the more bread a man eats the better he is, that though perspiring is painful, eating is comparatively more pleasant, and it is better to perspire more in order to eat more than to perspire less with the prospect of eating less.

Misapplication of the law of conservation of mechanical energy has for long supported the idea that the more a man eats the stronger he grows. But food is not by itself energy. It is not the quantity of comestibles eaten, not even the quantity digested, but the quantity assimilated that constitutes physiological energy. The relation between nervous energy and muscular energy is still obscure, and it will be a long time yet before science can determine the nature and quantity of food a particular man should consume for the purpose of obtaining and retaining the maximum energy. The general idea on the subject so far has been that every man has a fixed power of assimilation and that it is better for him to make available to that power more substance than it can assimilate than to present less to it, it being understood that the rejected substance would pass out of the system without leaving any harmful trace behind. But this idea is gradually changing, and it is now being increasingly held that a comparatively small quantity of food consumed is better than a comparatively large quantity, the standard being the unknown quantity which taxes the power of assimilation to the best advantage. Fasting is better than surfeit. Deficit is better than excess; moderation is better than intemperance and gluttony. The problem however is in the experimental stage.

The ratio between the quantity of bread consumed and the quantity of sweat exuded being fixed, the pain of sweating might be partially evaded by reducing the pleasure of eating. But man, as a rule, is so ardent in his desire for this pleasure that he is prepared to submit to the pain of sweating for the purpose of enjoying it. This desire was created while man was yet in paradise where food was like manna. Among the robust Western people, the most civilized of modern times, the best thing in life is a good dinner. The "good things of life" are laid on the table every evening. Johnson said not very long ago that "a man may travel all over the world without finding any thing better than dinner."

The western people are to be congratulated even on being able to imagine that any thing better than dinner can be found in this world. But so far their nomadism on land and water has been almost invariably inspired by the prospect of good dinner and its continuance through life. They work hard in fields and factories for dinner. They wage war against neighbours for dinner. They depopulate countries and continents for dinner. They

enslave people wholesale for dinner. They send their children to school that they may have dinner when they grow old. Education for the sake of knowledge is now sincerely repudiated as camouflage. When it is said that man does not live by bread alone, no spiritual idea is necessarily intended to be conveyed ; for a man can live by cake also, if he is shrewd enough. When the King of France said, "if they have no bread why don't they eat cake?" he probably had this idea of the life-supporting value of cake in his mind.

Another implication of the curse of Adam is that the perspiration caused by the exertion to produce food should be still present when it is eaten, that is to say, that man shall consume immediately what he produces, which has for its corollary that he shall save nothing. The habit of saving and of creating capital, it will appear, has been the most potent factor, first, in disturbing the ratio between the bread consumed and the sweat exuded, and then in completely divorcing the pleasure of consumption from the pain of production, and lastly in creating a hereditary class of parasites.

Lastly, it may be mentioned here as a relevant fact that the prayer, "Give us this day our daily bread," standing in the face of the curse of Adam, by persons who have accumulated enough wealth for themselves and their progeny sounds like a piece of unredeemed irreverence. This prayer was probably intended for the time, subsequent to the establishment of the kingdom of God on Earth. But that kingdom was not established by Christ in his first advent, and the second advent is still waited for. The prayer virtually asks God to withdraw the Curse of Adam, and cleverly reminds Him that it has failed and is therefore unworthy of being retained in the Bible. But probably Christ meant the prayer not for the rich, but for the poor, who sweated for finding food for others while they themselves starved. Uttered by them the prayer contains a request for retributive justice without any vindictive implications. The labourers of the present day however do not appeal to God for help, but assert themselves in strikes and in other ways, and compel their parasitic oppressors to part with a fraction of their profits to be converted into wages. The iron law of wages has made the law of profits soft and plastic by its heated blows. But after all the conflict between capital and labour is a conflict for dinner, and has no high spiritual inspiration behind it.

EVASION OF THE CURSE OF ADAM.

A very important implication of the curse of Adam is that it has no application to the precultural stages of life ; for bread is made of wheat, and wheat is produced by agriculture. An astute rich man living in the West in modern times might perhaps, lawyer-like cleverly argue that he is not, except in a small measure, subject to the curse, because though society has advanced to the industrial, after having successfully passed through the agricultural, stage of human life, bread forms only an insignificant part of his food, most of which belongs to the pastoral and hunting stages of progress.

The change from the pastoral to the agricultural mode of life is accompanied by a corresponding change in the character of food ; surely our ancestors did not sweat in the fields for mere aesthetic gratification. It is not known that in any civilization in the past the food of pastoral life has been entirely supplanted by that of agricultural life, but the tendency has always been towards that consummation. Instead of eating the flesh of the cow man has resorted to milk and its products, possibly out of growing reverence for life. But with the progress of western civilization animal food is growingly reasserting itself, and the consumption of wheat in all its variety of forms is gradually dwindling among the richer, that is to say, among the more advanced sections of society. Wheat forms a mere supplement in the good things of life with which the rich man's table is loaded. Poor people sweat in the field and live mainly on bread. They do not draw for their food upon the slaughter houses of Chicago ; and as to Smithfield, it is all but inaccessible to them. In India the consumption of animal food is nominal. It is almost absent among the higher castes of Hindus ; and the Mussalmans, inspite of the reported cases of fighting with the Hindus on festive occasions, do not consume much cow's flesh. Cow slaughter in India is chiefly intended for the Christian ruling classes, who keep the memory of their home traditions green. Irreverence for life is characteristic of western civilization with all its implications of lack of genuine sympathy and compunction, and the historian has no difficulty in perceiving that this irreverence is the prime factor in the progress of that civilisation. It has rendered exploitation easy, and has kept the ape and tiger quality in man in sound and efficient condition. It has enabled him to evade the Curse of Adam more effectively than the highest achievements of science.

Evasion of the curse is possible in two ways, namely, (1) by the power of science designed to enable man to produce much with little labour, and (2) by the power of systematically consuming what others produce. The first power is intellectual and the second moral. The two powers are mutually helpeful in western cviliza-tion. They are so blended in acutal operation that they look like a single undivided and indivisible faculty. There is a third method of evading the curse, which proved partially successful in India in the past, but which under the pressure of foreign culture is being increasingly abandoned. To avoid the pain of sweating Indian sages suggested, from a high spiritual point of view, abstention from the pleasure of eating bread. Of course no man can live without eating food for any length of time. At the same time excessive eating, which implies excessive sweating is now scientifically regarded as injurious to life. The minimum quantity of food required for maintaining health, if it could be found, would be the most important discovery in hygiene and most beneficial to mankind. But it will be a long time before that discovery can be made. Besides a general formula will perhaps be futile. And so long as that discovery is not made the struggle between work and wages will go on and every man will try to work less and to consume more.

The history of the evasion of the Curse of Adam is virtually the history of exploitation. Exploitation is of two kinds, *viz.* Exploitation of Nature and Exploitation of Neighbour. The Exploitation of Nature is primarily intellectual in character and seems to be morally colourless. In truth, however, this exploitation is open to criticism from two points of view. In the first place exploitation of Nature on a large scale is impssoible without exploitation of Neighbours of the present generation. In the second place it cannot be carried on indefinitely without injuring future generations, who will find the earth either completely exhausted or so drained that the proportion of wage to work will perceptibly decrease. After the great war the miners complained that the ores were too deep to permit the old unit of labour to bring to the surface the old unit of raw material. The exploitable volume of the earth's crust is limited. Its depth cannot exceed five miles, and probably it does not exceed one mile. The deeper the exploiter goes the more difficult he finds his work, and the sweating is out of proportion to the bread obtained. However this kind of exploitation, though morally objectionable is by no means very reprehensible, for it

may be argued that science will possibly open ways of utilizing natural resources without much additional cost in labour. But the burden of proving that science admits of indefinite progress lies on the exploiters of the present generation, and so long as they depend upon mere chance or possibility they cannot claim the right of indefinite exploitation, against the interests of persons yet unborn and therefore unable to assert themselves openly. It is generally affirmed that western civilization is accumulating wealth, instead of spending it lavishly, because of its solicitude for the interests of future generations. There can be no doubt that it is accumulating wealth, which may be available to future generations, but it can not be asserted that the interests of the future generations openly or directly enter into the consciousness of the final cause of the accumulation. Professor Keynes seems to regard the accumulative instinct as the result of a deep-seated superstition or illusion. He says :—

"The capitalist classes were allowed to call the best part of the cake (accumulated wealth) theirs and were theoretically permitted to consume it, on the tacit underlying condition that they consumed very little of it in practice. The duty of saving became nine-tenths of virtue and the growth of the cake the object of true religion. There grew round the non-consumption of the cake all those instincts of puritanism which in other ages has withdrawn itself from the world and has neglected the arts of production as well as those of enjoyment. And so the cake increased ; but to what end was not clearly contemplated. Individuals would be exhorted not so much to abstain as to defer, and to cultivate the pleasures of security and anticipation."

Thus it will appear that excessive exploitation of nature is not morally defensible, though its reprehensibleness is not easily detected, and constitutes a delicate problem in casuistry. It is remarkable that the principle of optimism being the cult of western civilization any thing calculated to give rise to pessimistic prognostication should be avoided. Pessimists of a cultured type are, however, already springing up by hundreds. Should the spirit of unbelief in the principle of optimism, to say nothing of the spirit of pessimism, come to dominate the heart of the majority of the cultured people, the bottom of western civilization will be knocked out of it like the spangled head of the snake, which in the mind of the uncultivated

Hindu supports the earth in the void of infinite space. The principle of optimism is that though men do come and men do go society lives for ever, and *progressively*. Its ideal, as a cult, is that society is approaching to a state of perfection when wage will bear no proportion to work, and all men will eat bread and also cake without sweating ; when the law of conservation of energy will be completely relaxed in favour of man. Excessive exploitation of nature on the other hand will make that law run in the opposite direction and make man's life extremely miserable. It invites, in short, the destruction of western civilization, and is therefore open to moral animadversion. The history of this type of exploitation is quite modern and does not extend beyond one hundred and fifty years. But within this short period it has performed stupendous *Harikari* in the bowels of the earth, and has rendered the comforts and conveniences of life more costly than before. No doubt the great war is largely responsible for this, but great wars are inseparable accidents of western civilization, and can no more be eliminated from it than hydrogen can be eliminated from water.

As to exploitation of neighbour the theory is quite sound while men believe in its necessity and righteousness. It becomes shaky and unstable when the belief begins to oscillate. The fight between cosmic necessity and sentimental morality obstructs human progress, upward as well as downward, by its indecisive results. The history of western civilization exhibits periods of decisive victories gained by cosmic necessity, and it is by the results of these victories that western civilization stands erect, though the victories themselves are condemned by historians as inhuman. It is like denouncing robbery which fattens on stolen property, that is, property stolen by ancestors, near or remote, better if remote.

Midway between the two kinds of exploitation mentioned above lies the exploitation of animal energy. God gave man "dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth". This dominion did not explicitly extend to the privilege of eating the flesh of the animals. Herbs and fruits were his meat in paradise, and when expelled from it man at once took to the habit of eating mutton, beef and bread. He afterwards learnt to use cattle as carriers and drawers. He was

privileged to so use them. The cattle drew his plough and carried his crops home and to the market, and when wheels were discovered the exploitation of cattle as drawers was much enlarged. Cruelty to animals was largely practised. But the term had a limited signification. Merely making the animals work against their will was not cruelty, for this was covered by the term 'dominion'. Cruelty meant only such torture as was practised for its own sake, and not for the purpose of exploitation. Slaughter of cattle is not an offence, but the causing of unnecessary pain in the process is sinful. The exploitation of cattle, except for purposes of eating their flesh, is being substituted by the exploitation of inanimate nature, and ploughs and vehicles are now drawn by steam and electricity. This substitution is not the result of kindness and compunction, but is due to the fact that the exploitation of animal energy is less efficient and more costly. There is likeness between this substitution and that of free labour for slave labour. The abolition of slavery has no moral significance. All its value lies in the sphere of economics. The credit for the abolition belongs not to the advancing morality of man, but to his intellectuality. The partial abolition of the exploitation of animal energy does not proclaim the triumph of Christian morality, but of the science of civilization.

The slaughter of cattle goes on increasing with the progress of western civilization. Ten thousand heads are killed every day at Chicago, and the flesh distributed over the world in tin cans, and Chicago is one of many slaughtering places. In India there was a king who killed 250 heads daily for the use of his guests. But Chicago caters for the entire world, for countless paying guests.

A refined form of exploiatiotn is practised in the shape of milching. The milk is transformed in numerous ways for final consumption. Curd, butter, cheese, ghee, chhana, ghol, etc. are some of the names of the forms in which milk is consumed. The calf is given enough to live upon. It is sometimes killed to supply meat while the milking is carried on by painful processes.

Towns which consume most milk and meat keep an organization for the prevention of cruelty to animals ; and much cruelty is practised in the name of prevention of cruelty. Mysterious are the ways of civilization. Nothing is done in a straight-forward way. Complicity and camouflage add relish to civilization.

The curse, as it stands recorded in the Book of Genesis, and as interpreted above, condemnd all men and women and their children and children's children to sweating toil on penalty of death to the end of time. This curse stands as a divinely ordained law, or as a law of Nature, as we now designate such ordinances in science, The laws of Nature are ordinarily supposed to be perpetual and inexorable. But scientific men who are also philosophers do not consider it impossible that they are subject to modification or termination, though practically and for all human purposes they are immutable. It cannot be said that the curse, once passed, limited the power of God to change it or toput an end to its further operation. God afterwards promised that he would send his son to put an end to it after man had been disciplined enough to receive the boon. God also in his infinite wisdom endowed man with freedom of choice subject of course to limitations specifically imposed by Him. It was open to man to try to eat bread without sweat in his face, and his success depended on the condition that he would respect the commandments, and one of these commandments was that every man should love his neighbour as himself. Any act or behaviour showing that he loved himself more than his neighbourwould eventually defeat his endeavour, whatever success he might attain temporarily. The evasion of the curse during the last five thousand years has been effected by a more or less violent disobedience of the above commandment. This disobedience has been most pronounced and emphatic during the last four hundred years, that is to say, since the inauguration of what is known as western civilization, and among people who rhetorically call themselves Christians, or devoted followers of the son of God to make the disobedience shine more brightly in the blazing success of their evasive operations. But their success has lasted for some generations, and most of them believe that it will not only last for ever, but will show increasing brightness. There are perceptible, however, quickly growing signs that the success will terminate in disastrous failure.

A small difference of brain and brawn gave one brother an advantage over another which he utilized for the purpose of evading the Curse of Adam. The second sweated for the first. As this spread over a large area, public opinion became reconciled to it, and what was an infringement of the moral order came to be regarded as an instance of the natural order. Small natural differences were

exaggerated and perpetuated by art. Natural superiority was reinforced by conventional superiority, and the divergence between the superior and the inferior grew in mass and strength till the inferior became slaves. Slowly the very psychology of the society changed so as to turn mere acquiescence into acceptance, and acceptance into conviction. The difference was perpetuated by the conventional law of inheritance and succession confused with the natural law of heredity. The conventional difference was at first proportionately larger than the natural difference, and in course of time intensified the latter. Natural difference was either accidental and ephemeral or fixed for life. It might be caused by fortuitous incident or by remediable disease. To take advantage of such difference was not only cruel but cowardly. The machine of convention grinded slowly and surely, and once declared inferior, a man had very great difficulty in washing out the stigma. In some societies it became indelible.

Fortuitous, temporary differences between race and race, between nation and nation often lead to marvellous results. Victory in war is a matter of luck ; but a decisive victory once gained makes one nation slave for another for a long time, if not for ever. In a moment of weakness in the Indian nation the British found an advantage which has given them an Empire,—an illimitable field for exploitation and administration,—which has been utilized to widen the divergence so as to make the weak still weaker, and the strong still stronger. Compare the position of England under James I. and of India under Jehangir, and compare the position of the two countries in the present year of grace 1924, and the power of accidents on national condition will be at once obvious. India now sweats and starves, while she produces bread and cake,—bread buttered on both sides and cake filled with apples—for the enjoyment of Englishmen. She has been given a corresponding psychology to keep her contented, peacefully and complacently living on crumbs thrown from the exploiters' table.

Germany is now slaving to pay reparations to England and France, though she was admittedly considered superior for half a century. Empires have risen and fallen ; Nations have eaten bread in the sweat of other nations' faces, and the history of the evasion of the Curse of Adam constitutes the most interesting branch in the history of mankind. At present the majority of mankind eat bread

in the sweat of their faces, and only a small minority eat it unsoaked in salt water. Every nation suffers sweating, and national progress bears an inverse ratio to the quantity of sweat exuded from the bodies of men. The object of civilization seems to be to defeat the curse or law of God. But the success of civilization so far has not been considerable.

The revolt of the minority of mankind against the curse of Adam would have been futile but for the curse of Eve, which in the in the first place made woman a dependant of man, and in the second, filled the world with more men than there was bread. The curse of Cain helped the minority by making the majority mere vagabonds and fugutives on earth. They are like the Jews of the middle ages who, scattered over Europe, accumulated wealth for the benefit of the rich among the settled population. The several curses united to produce the same result. God's curse is another name for the Devil's blessing. The supreme being has two sides. The Devil represents the dark side, and what is ordinarily known as God is the bright side of that Being. The anthropomorphic God can never be identified with the absolute. Mankind became divided into exploiters and exploited. The exploited bore the curses, and the exploiters remained as near to paradise as Adam and Eve before the fall, with the important difference that they have the tree of knowledge in their possession, and can eat its fruits without further molestation. Indeed they have been eating it for a long fime in the past, and are expecting to eat it for a long time in the tuture, though Bolshevism is threatening them.

The history of pre-social life is not accurately known to man. He has discovered no reliable record of any kind, in stone or bone to enlighten him on the subject under discussion. shortly after the expulsion of Adam and Eve from paradise the entire population, albeit infinitesimal in number was reduced to hard labour. We know Cain became a cultivator, while Abel lived a pastrol life. Spencer thinks they were chiefs of agricultural and pastrol communities respectively. Abel was not cursed like Cain. He lived in the favour of God, and as he did not eat bread, he had no sweat dripping from his face. But how long his offsprings continued to live the pastoral life is not known. His family have either disappeared or changed their mode of living.

At the present moment out of seventeen hundred million people about sixteen hundred million toil and moil for their daily bread under precarious conditions which compel them, according to Christian doctrines, daily to look for the mercy of God, and to appeal to Him every morning with the object of inducing Him not to withhold from them the daily ration soaked in salt water. For this alone can be the meaning of the daily prayer, "Give us this day our daily bread." The other hundred million souls having secured enough bread coated with butter, with cake added unto it, have gradually ceased to say their morning prayer as an unprofitable waste of time and thought.

During the last hundred and fifty years the total population of the world inspite of wars, and massacres, famines and pestilences, cyclones and earthquakes, cannibalism and infanticide, to say nothing of less impressive forms of death, has increased five fold, *i.e.* from about three hundred million to seventeen hundred million. This increase is enormous, having regard to the fact that what man had failed to accomplish in a hundred thousand years he has accomplished in one hundred and fifty. This is the period covered by the mechanical and industrial revolution. The supply of subsistence also has no doubt increased. But it is inconceivable that it has increased in the same ratio as the population, for though much virgin soil has been brought under cultivation, at the same time that the methods of cultivation have improved, yet it is hard to believe that the total quantity of food crops has kept pace with the geometrically increasing population, specially in those parts of the world where the population has been dense for many hundred years. The most advanced countries in the old world now live upon food largely imported from the new world. England is unable to produce more than a fourth part of the food grains consumed by her people. If the above rate of progress of poepulation be maintained during the next hundred and fifty years the total population of the world will be more than a billion by the end of the twenty second century. Further progress will make the world over crowded in the sense that the average individual will not have more than twelve square feet of ground, the area required for his burial. The density of population threatens in the near future to exceed the final limit fixed by the laws of economics and of hygiene. We are thus passing through an interesting period in human history to its

final crisis. This crisis is not likely to be put off by schemes of disarmament and compulsory cessation of war. Some scheme of world-wide importance must be found to arrest the surging tide of growing population, or Nature will be constrained to exercise unutterably monstrous cruelties to prevent the world from bursting or running into utter Chaos,—cruelties compared with which Japanese earthquakes, Bengal cyclones, Madras famines or Chinese floods will look like child's play. Man expected some final solution of the crucial problem from the great world war. That war seems to have been designed by providence to serve the same purpose as the advent of John the Baptist was designed in connection with the redemptive scheme designated as Christianity. That war has terminated for the time being, but the heat generated has not been dissipated into infinite space, but has sunk beneath the surface in the heart of man transfigured from the kinetic to the potential form of energy. Either man must reduce population, or Nature will reduce it for him. Man may do the work silently, but Nature will do it tumultuously and spectacularly. The dismal devil finds more pleasure in torture than in slaughter.

The problem of population has become insistent for a definite solution. The glare of the dismal devil has developed an unprecedented degree of ferocity and terrific monstrosity by his cataotrophic fascination producing phenomenal stupefaction in the most advanced races of mankind. These races, under the generic name of the 'white man' have suddenly developed a tremendous reproductive energy aided by a stupendous productive ingenuity, nourished as much by the exploitation of nature as by that of neighbour. The whiteman is now ubiquitous. He is found in the tropics and the poles, and has permanently occupied nearly the whole of the temperate zone on both sides of the equator. He circumnavigates the world with a thermometer in his hand, and wherever he finds the thermal readings favourable he squats and settles, be it in the heights of the Himalayas or in the depths of Columbian forests. Elsewhere he does not settle, but visits and exploits from an outpost, which he uses as a base of operation. The Himalayas form the outpost for the exploitation of India.

As to the problem of population among the black, brown and yellow races he follows a double policy. In the temperate zone where he settles he exterminates the original population, after calling

them the aboriginal people. In the hotter regions he encourages the aborigines to multiply themselves. Where he exterminates he fills the land with a rapidly growing white population. Thus the total population of the world grows with tremendous rapidity. The double policy is designed to facilitate exploitation of the natural resources of the world. Its effect is to exhaust those resources more quickly than nature intended, and to bring on the end with catastrophic quickness. That end will come much earlier than the complete exhaustion of the resources. It will certainly not wait for the cooling of the sun. The dismal devil is preparing the world for a spectacular destructive demonstration transcending the power of the most comprehensive imagination to anticipate and compass. The devil has his own ways of dealing with population. The Malthusian law does not imply that the ratio between population and subsistence is constant. Sometimes a large population is maintained on small rations, it may be on reduced health. But the problem is obscured by the subjective element in the quantity of food required for healthy life. At all events the balance between food supply and population may remain disturned for a long time, after which a sudden disaster comes unawares and causes havoc on a shocking scale.

For the purpose of effectively evading the curse of Adam man has divided himself into three primary selves, *viz.*, the personal self, the group self and the human self. The first self takes care of his personal interests, the second those of the group to which he belongs or attaches himself by choice, and the third takes care of the interests of humanity as a whole. The three selves have three different standards of Ethics or Moral life, and they assert themselves sometimes severally and sometimes jointly and confusedly. Occasionally one of the selves, either by the power of impulse or by the strong urge of reason, trumphs over the other two and controls the activities of the personal organism. As a rule in the routine course of life the personal self stands supreme, and the interests of the other two selves are taken into account only so far as they are conducive to the interests of the personal self. On rare occasions the group self dictates to the other two selves, and calls on them to make sacrifices great or small. This is specially observed in time of war, when men rush tothe front regardless of discomforts and risks. The third self is the weakest in the organism of selves, so

far as the past history of man discloses their relative strength Idealists hope that in the remote future this self will reign supreme in peace and perpetuity, the other two selves surrendering themselves to its dictates. But if the past is the prophet of the future in any sense the optimism of Idealism seems to be unsubstantial. The different races are knowing one another more intimately than before, but instead of loving, the more they know the more they hate. One race hugs another with the love of *Dhritarastra* who reduced Bhima's iron image to mere pulp.

The group self is subdivided chiefly into the family self, the class or communal self, the national self and the racial self. There are other forms of group self already in existence and more may be invented hereafter for the purpose of evading god's curse respecting the relation between cost and compensation in self and race conservation.

Every man is consciously or subconsciously trying to impose upon others his share of the sweat that the curse of Adam demands. Every group of men is trying to impose upon other groups the sweat required of it. Among the groups the nation is the most powerful and widespread. Every nation tries to exploit other nations, directly by force, or diplomatically by fraud. Exploitation means that the exploited nation should place its services at the disposal of the exploiting nation without demanding adequate remuneration. Force and fraud are both at the back of exploitation. Sometimes force and sometimes fraud plays the supreme part, but as a rule they play together. After all force and fraud are not such monstrosities as we suppose them to be. They have made the world what it is. They have civilized it. It is inconsistent to denounce them and at the same time to praise civilization, particularly the Western variety of it. Some people think they can retain civilization as an accomplished fact, and send the means by which it has been attained to the gallows, as if they were like a ladder which might be kicked down when the roof had been reached.

A group of men instead of making the interest of humanity the guiding principle of conduct follow the shorter and smoother line suggested by the interest of the group to which they belong; and it is to be noted that the group interest is wider and nobler than the interest of the individual; and that one group succeeds in exploiting another in proportion as its members subordinate

the personal self to the group self. This subordination sometimes extends to conscious annihilation, as an extremely probable fact, of the prseonal self. The reward of the hero lies in posthumous applause. Whether imperative impulse or calculating reason forms the real urge of the suicidal jump, the hero is esteemed all over the world for the bare fact that the group self has subordinated his personal self. Sometimes it is even suspected that the human self of the hero has for the moment triumphed over his personal self, and when this genuinely occurs the hero really deserves the highest praise. In him for the time being the lower selves have sacrificed themselves at the altar of the highest ; true love has displaced hatred of neighbour ; the love of God has displaced the love of life ; reality has annihilated illusion.

Some people think the group self is higher than the personal self and that to reach the human self the personal self must pass through it. The human self is perhaps not an aggregation of personal selves or of group selves, and neither philanthropy nor federalism can truly make man human.

Exploitation has made such a big jump during the last century and a half that we are apt to suppose that it is an invention of modern times, and especially of Western civilization. The truth is that exploitation had its origin in the desire to eat bread without sweat in the face, in the desire to evade the curse of Adam. It has received statutory sanction from the original compact by which society was formed, and it has ever since been developing with a growing rate of progress until now its intensiveness as well as its extensiveness has nearly reached the climax. This double progress is due not merely to the growing debauchment of the moral sentiment, but to a greater extent to the development of the inventive genuis of man. The glamour of intellectuality obscures the black spots of restless morality quivering behind it. The power of applied science backed by the subtleties of a meandering morality, which challenges criticism by its limitless massiveness, while its perfection of continuity has raised Western civilization to the top of the world, which is ceaselessly scheming to evade God's curse, *i.e.*, to defeat His law.

In the midst of conflict of opinion as to the circumstances in which society was formed, and as to the exact nature of the object aimed at, *viz.*, as to whether it was mere preservation or amelioration

of human condition, one fact stands out conspicuously, *viz.*, that some individuals obtained the privilege of commanding while the duty of the rest was to obey them unquestioningly, subject to certain undefined limits. Power was organized and concentrated in a definite group while the duty of submission was paid by or exacted from scattered masses severally, *i.e.*, from each individual separately Tax was gathered from every man and put into a common purse, commanded by one man or a small group of men. There was thus established the Empire of the minority over the majority, which was gradually transformed into a parasitic oligarchy. The new arrangement did not excite revolt so long as it did not violently interfere with the common liberties of every day life, and proved, successful wherever the rulers were moderate in their demands on the patience and tolerance of the people. In course of time the psychology of submission, started by acquiescence, was consolidated and stabilized into custom. Custom again was slowly changed until the moral sentiment of the people was sufficiently transformed to convert the consciousness of wrong from a sense of toleration to that of open approbation. Free criticism of the ruling class was condemned by public opinion, and combination for any disloyal purpose was prevented by law, which received the sanctity of divine commandment from State propaganda. Thus the difference between the ruler and ruled, the powerful and the weak, the superior and the inferior, grew in width and depth increasingly facilitating exploitation, which was ramified in diverse directions. Free barter of service or commodity made room for contract executed on the part of the weak with the sword of hunger hanging over them, and the result was that pinched by the necessity of immediate relief they feared to press for terms without which their future would become worse, and their faces suffused with a thicker layer of perspiration, while sitting with their wives and children down to dinner. The weak became weaker, and the strong grew stronger until the relationship of Master and Slave was established between them. This was the lowest depth to which exploitation could morally descend. Exploitation next took a backward turn because there was no lower depth to descend to; and after a thousand years it was also discovered that slavery did not symbolise an economically profitable form of exploitation. The natural result was that slavery was raised to serfdom, and in course of time serfdom was transformed into villeinage. A further advance found the villeins turned into

yeomen, and yeomen became middle class gentlemen, leaving a large residue of landless labourers to carry on the menial part of the productive work for the upkeep of society. The descendants of these landless labourers form the proletariat of the present day, simultaneously impoverished and vitalized by the mechanical revolution of the last years of the Eighteenth Century. They were huddled up in factories and tenements, where physical conglomeration slowly led to political combination, against which the statutory privileges of parasites and capitalists proved unavailing after a prolonged struggle which lasted for nearly a century.

The backbone of parasitism has been broken by the power of political combination, whose utility was suggested by the power of economic combination invented by the capitalists for their own benefits, illustrating the conflict between immediate and remote good as the guide of activity. Irrigation which brings prosperity is ultimately followed by Malaria which causes depopulation. Imperialism is followed by rebarbarisation. Ascent and descent follow the course of the trajectory. Life is a Sisyphean struggle. Trade-unionism, the symbol of combination, has been instrumental in teaching the proletariat the value of temporary sacrifice reaped in permanent benefit, which the Christian priesthood had failed to impress upon mankind by their teachings extending over two thousand years. The benefit has now been dazzlingly visualized by the fact that in half of Europe the representatives of the proletariat hold the reins of government in their hands, while in the other half they have a distinctly audible voice in the framing of the ideals of governance, and in formulating the methods for their attainment.

The creation of a third class between the commanding and the obeying sections has given a character of complexity to the process of exploitation. This third class combined the traits of the exploiting and the exploited classes. It is a hermaphrodite class that largely blurred the conceptual distinction between the two main groups of society, while it has made the condition of the lowest class worse by the multiplication of new modes of exploitation, and making the evasion of the old modes difficult. Sambo and Quimbo, two famous personalities in H. B. Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, belong to this third class, which has now ramified into diverse sub-classes, as service-holders, professionals and vocationals. They are mulattoes

by descent and character. They are like bats, birds or beasts at convenience. They are liberals in possession of the borderland between labour and conservatives. They sometimes keep the balance between the two parties, but generally obstruct the progress of society towards equality, liberty and fraternity. In England at the present moment, as a political class, they are in a sad plight.

THE DISMAL DEVIL'S GLARE IN THE DARK—IV

External Exploitation.

Just as internal exploitation in Western Europe was showing a tendency towards extinction, an unlimited field for external exploitation was presented to Europe by the discovery of the so-called New World. The genius of Columbus was the Devil's gift, that turned Europe into a pandemonium, in which the nations of the West were engaged in scrambling for the best viands of the banqueting hall gathered from the remotest corners of the world. Industrial and military exploitation divided the proletariat into trained production and protection forces. The latter are now distributed over land, water and air, and consist of soldiers, sailors and airmen. Their ostensible object is to afford protection from external attack, but the reality has a greater weight of aggressiveness than of defensive precaution. Their cost, ordinarily met from taxes, must eventually be recouped from external exploitation, directly or indirectly. They prevent unemployment by being employed on apparently unremunerative work, which must in the long run be either recouped from external sources or lead to internal bankruptcy. The tremendous increase in armaments during the early years of the present century, specially in England and Germany, leading eventually to what is now known as the Great War, implied an expenditure of wealth which instead of being recouped in any of the belligerent countries has led to the collapse of the trade and exploitation for whose facilitation it was primarily designed. Neither victor nor vanquished has gained in prestige, power or wealth. On the contrary while the vanquished lies on the ground, the victor is heart-broken, palsied, paralysed and moribund. It

has been tersely said by a philosopher that the vanquished is dead and the victor is dying. The curse of the exploited nations has at length reached the exploiting rivals, while self-consciousness is encouraging the former to challenge further exploitation. The weaker nations are growingly refusing to sweat for the benefit of the stronger ones, and the latter are woefully acquiescing, and submitting to the decree of Nemesis. We look upon the theory of eschatological retributive justice with suspicion, and substitute the theory of this paradise of abundance and happiness on earth for the spirit populated kingdom of heaven engaged in the disinterested service of God, and establish in practice the kingdom of the devil on earth as a substitute for the eternal perdition of theology.

No theory of paradise on earth has so far contemplated the happiness of all ; every one of them is contaminated by partiality and preferential treatment. Utilitarianism, within or without evolution, cannot compass anything beyond the indefinite greatest happiness of the indefinite greatest number. The actual result is that not only is the percentage of people living in poverty and discontent, and eating bread in the sweat of their faces increasing with each advance in civilization, but the sweat on each face is becoming more profuse, as the result of hard labour on the one hand and of the apprehension that the opportunity for such labour may be withheld from them, on the other. The optimism which suggests to Western civilization the approach of the kingdom of abundance and contentment is a catastrophic emotion that has been steadily leading the civilized races to abysmal ruin. It seems the theory of life discovered by biological science is in need of a drastic emendation, to find the true mission of human life. The entire structure of civilization built at colossal cost upon the current biological foundation without a careful examination of the latter in its substance, cement and form, has proved to be a wasteful expenditure of the wealth of human energy and intelligence sunk in third class brick and worse mortar. If instead of trying to challenge God's law as a curse coming from a vindictive enemy, man had tried to penetrate into its inner meaning which warned him against the evil involved in the increasing consumption of bread, he might have been more happy though less showy. Western civilization is a sacrifice of the inner life for an outer display. It can only lead

to bankruptcy both moral and intellectual, and to its inevitable consequences. It has wasted and exhausted the useful metals of the world to pile up the beautiful ones, and to build up a gilded temple to the Devil, accessible to a few, who worship inside, and inaccessible to the untouchable multitudes who are directed to lay themselves prostrate outside the temple. The offerings and sacrifices are tremendous in magnitude presenting a hecatomb, and the feasting is a bacchanalian orgy in which the privileged few take part with heaps of leavings which the multitude scramble for, without satisfying the appetites of their stomach, for the problem of population remains unsolved, though an oceanic quantity of sweat has been poured upon it, and the fascinating terrors of the Dismal Devil's Glare keep mankind chained in mirthful melancholy and stupefying intoxication.

Western civilization has failed because it is only an aggravated continuation of primitive barbarism, based upon the principle of self-assertion in defiance of the laws and commandments of the Father in Heaven re-interpreted and re-emphasised by the son of man If man had cheerfully sweated for his neighbour's benefit instead. of trying to make them sweat for him Western civilization might have fulfilled the mission of true civilization with less show and greater power and longer stability. It is not too late to think of making this new experiment with the sermon on the Mount engraved on the heart.

The discoveries of Columbus and other adventurers of the deep led to the revival of ancient nomadism in a new form and on a gigantic scale. The new nomads left no trail on their way and formed no lengthening chain of population. They flew over thousands of miles of liquid deserts and poured upon land wherever they found it convenient to settle. They went as squatters and settled as colonists. They soon assumed the traits of barbarous tribalism, and set themselves against already existing tribes of the neighbourhood. They asked the latter to bear their portion of the sweat required by the curses of Adam, and when they refused they fired their guns upon them, for they always kept themselves equipped with gunpowder which the devil had prepared out of the sulphurous gas into which God had hurled headlong, him and his host to roll in visible darkness for nine times the space which covers night and day. Indeed it was a long time to allow to the inventive genius

of the devil, who utilised his new environment to prepare the explosive poison which he subsequently, after long patience, extending over four thousand and five hundred years, disclosed to man, when starting the modern epoch of tribalism, racialism, civilized barbarism, and debauching industrialism. Thus continents were depopulated and re-populated ; and the old Aryan nomadism which had taken thirty thousand years to thinly expand over the small continent of Europe and a small fragment of Asia, now assumed undreamt of dimensions overcrowding larger continents in the course of three hundred years. The Aryan woman is perhaps the fecundest wife in the world.

A late Governor of Bengal said half in humour and half in seriousness that Lady W.'s gown always kept children concealed within it, and when shaken it poured them out by the dozen. The civilized woman regulates her fecundity by the fertility of the earth where she resides. Women who were all but barren in their European home suddenly developed an undreamt of extravagance in maternity on settling in America. The Canadian of French origin perhaps rears the largest family in the world. He is the true follower of the vicar of Wakefield who half a century before Malthus was unflinchingly of opinion that the man who married and brought up a large family did more service than one who lived single and only talked of population. It appears that in America European settlers had until lately a horror of single life and a feeling of loathing against the Malthusian sect of Christians. In the course of about two hundred years, cultured sentiment in America has veered round to bachelorhood, spinsterhood and small family, because arithmetical progression can never keep pace with geometrical, because mother earth is naturally less fertile than the mother that develops out of the wife ; and persistence in reproductive extravagance would lead to social degradation, international degeneration and ultimately to starvation. "Take care of your standard of living" is the motto engraved in every respectable heart in the civilized world. There is another motto which lies clerverly hidden at its back, *viz.*, "Beware of your neighbour raising the standard of living." "For, when that transcends yours, you have as good as fallen to that extent." In sheer jealousy lies the moral foundation on which Western civilization is firmly built ; and hate is the cement by which jealousy is kept in working order.

The European immigrants who settled in America did not carry with them the old motto, "Thou shalt starve ere I want" for the Red Indians had no accumulated wealth to be robbed of. They did not carry with them the other motto, *viz.*, "The question is, whether thou canst kill me or I can kill thee," for the gun-powder which they possessed and which the Red Indians lacked, rendered such motto too mean to think of. They revived the ancient, pre-historic motto, "Thou must sweat for me or die." It must be said to the credit of the Red Indian that he refused to submit to the sweating, and preferred to die. Poverty of material property did not affect his spiritual wealth of chivalry and freedom. The result was that in the course of a century the old population was decimated, or driven westward, deprived of the means of livelihood on the Atlantic Coast. This Coast now forms the richest tract in the world. On the surface it looks like a paradise of property, prosperity, progress, paramountcy, power, privilege, pre-eminence. But beneath the surface there is a deep undercurrent of morbid morality, misery, melancholy, meanness, miscreance, and misdeeds. The scheme of life designed to enable one section of mankind to challenge divine law by compelling the rest of it to submit to it in a more abject manner than was intended by God, is from the religious point of view wicked and unsupportable. From the atheist's point of view, it has invariably proved a failure, and its ruins profusely lie scattered over the pages of history, *viz.*, Egyptian, Babylonian, Assyrian, Greek and Roman history. The scheme as planned and worked in the present epoch is already ramshackle.

No previous structure has stood erect for more than five hundred years, and the present one has begun to decline in four hundred, because its engineers have been more ambitious and more regardful of polish than of internal strength. It is the largest and the tallest structure in the history of civilisation and it is believed that its fall will affect the foundation to a larger extent than that of any of its predecessors. It may be hoped that when a new structure is designed, it will be on a new foundation—the foundation of love and charity as contrasted with the foundation of jealousy and hate. In short it will be built on the mount from which Christ thundered out his sermon, and not the mountain from which he was shown the splendid city, whose kingship he indignantly refused

I have said that the discovery of the New World led to the revival of tribalism. What we know of primitive tribalism is that it is associated with passionate self-assertion, ferocious rivalry, indiscriminate aggression, war, massacre, slavery and polygamy. The new tribalism is associated with supercilious self-assertion, discriminative aggression, sordid war, one sided massacre and sexual promiscuity. The squatters who went from homes with or without a definitely formed intention of being inhumanly aggressive, but always with the knowledge that such aggression was all but inevitable, formed small settlements or sequestered tribes with a number of muzzle loaders and an adequate quantity of gun-powder for their capital. All that they acquired in their new home for a long time was the interest and profit of this cleverly constructed capital, of which they made excellent effective use. There was no rivalry of capitalism because the Red Americans had no Capital, invested in gun-powder. The self-assertion of the colonists was supercilious, because it neither followed any settled custom nor feared any rivalry. Their aggression was discriminative, because murder and massacre were not their primary object. It was where exploitation met with obstruction that massacre was considered the next best thing. They did not spare the women of the victims, but enjoyed their persons without entering into any encumbering contract. Their wars were invariably sordid, because there was no chivalry, and because their self-assertion of right, natural or artificial, merely affirmed their convenience. Sir Charles Napier has said that the annexation of Sindh was a piece of advantageous rascality. The principle which underlies this terse enigma, forms a continuous undercurrent below the achievements of civilisation in America extending over a couple of centuries, during which the coloured population of that continent was replaced by the white races of Europe without detriment to the density of population in the old continent. But human nature cannot wholly shake off the idea that a civilisation which is helped by barbarism discloses an incompatible relation between means and end, and leads to the suspicion, if not to the positive conclusion, that it is not an ideal object of human aspiration. The use of wrong means for a right end becomes a target for criticism when failure ensues, either immediately or after a certain measure of success has been obtained. But so long as it is attended with success, partial or complete, it does not receive that contemptuous treatment which it richly deserves.

The experiment in America has been eminently successful so far, but it can not be said that the chain of success is complete, and has no chance of showing any breakage.

The growth, decline and end of a civilisation is sometimes compared to the growth, decay and death of a man. But we do not knowwhether in the life of a man decline isthe inevitable consequence of growth, or death the uniform effect of decline, or whother the infirmities of old age can be permanently or indefinitely postponed or whether death is an inseparable accident of the phenomenon of birth. We do not know whether senility can be permanently avoided by timely precautions or whether a man possessing a perfect knowledge of physiology, pathology and medicine and a perfect control over his passions can live indefinitely in the full vigour of prime or attain immortality in flesh and blood. We do not know whether a civilization can exist and grow permanently and indefinitely. So far all men have died either abruptly in full vigour by the sword or the plague or slowly by the enervation of the constitution through the intermediation of disease of some sort. None has survived indefinitely and death may come before birth, or immediately after it, or seventy to one hundred and twenty years later. Does the growth, decline and end of civilisation illustrate a similar law? Historians try to trace the decline of civilisation to certain defects in its constitution and manner of growth, indicating thereby that there is no necessary connection between growth and decline, the underlying idea being that a civilisation can develop indefinitely, nay permanently. Herbert Spencer, like most optimists, considers that immortality is the law of the life of civilization; and decline and death represent avoidable pathological conditions. The foundational idea which supports and strengthens Western civilization is that the latter is not only immortal, but will grow permanently, approaching to perfection quickly, or slowly, generally in a straight line and occasionally in curves, more or less crooked. This foundational idea has replaced the old theological idea of eschatological life without eliminating the idea of happiness and misery, but only changing their form, time and place. One cardinal distinction between the two ideas relating to the future of man being that in the one case man lives in the posterity, while in the other he lives in himself, after death. In the one case the good and evil of the individual descends to his children, and the good and evil

in the nature of one generation descends, by the law of heredity to the next, evil in the nature of every man accompanies his spirit after death, which marks a change in life but not a termination of it. In the first case the commonly accepted moral sentiments are for the most part mere figments of imagination or a passing phase in the life of civilization. In the other case these sentiments are unalterably fixed in the nature of man.

The soundness of Western civilization and its growth and permanency depend on the correctness of the foundational ideas on which it is consciously or unconsciously based ; and if those ideas are correct, *i.e.*, if they represent reality and truth, then it must be said that any criticism of that civilisation, from the stand point of theistic morality, is futile and worthless.

Such criticism is encouraged, however, by the distinction which the civilized races, out of regard for Christ & Christian, morality make between the morality of the group life & the morality of the individual life. The individual is a Christian, and the group life is the true life of Western civilization. The individual pretends to follow Christian morality, and to praise it ; but in the group life, such as in matters concerning national or communal welfare, the morality practised, and now even boldly professed, is the morality of self-assertion, which antagonises with the morality of self-negation. Civilization has not yet succeeded in fully separating group life from the summated total of individual lives. Hence confusion prevails in the criticism directed against Western civilization. As a rule the old man inclines to the morality of the individual inspite of the fact that he is a member of the society formed on Western principles. The young man on the other hand loudly proclaims the claims of the morality of the group life though he is a Christian. This makes the confusion doubly confounded for consistent criticism.

The vices of the individual life are the virtues of the group life and *vice versa*. Self-assertion is the soul of the latter. It is conceived by the spirit of self-assertion. It is maintained in health and vigour by the same spirit, and often dies by its violence. The individual may be self-assertive, but his inner soul always warns him against the unrighteousness of self-assertion. In his best moments he cheerfully suffers self-negation, and between self-assertion and self-negation he generally preserves the balance which enables

him to steer between the devil and deep sea in the voyage of life. The group life loses its vigour with the decline of self-assertion and comes to an end when self-assertion ceases to be effective, either through weakness or through violence. In India nationalism and material civilization declined because self-assertion became invertebrate by a broader and higher view of the life of the world,—by the discovery of a reallity behind appearance, which lessened the value of the latter, and led cultured minds to pursue a new course of life, with a high ideal, as yet too vague and hazy to suggest any definite scheme and methods. They made the natural endeavour to introduce a new course without wholly giving up the old. The fear of destruction was as strong as the desire for construction, and amalgamation produced hybirds which by their own mutual collisions as well as by their inherent weakness ultimately led to disaster. While the ideal was Nirvana for all schools of philosophy, the methods were divided between Truth, Love and Activism (জ্ঞান ভক্তি কর্ম্ম) By combination and permutation of these three a number of creeds were formed. The question of emphasis introduced further diversity. Love was divided between the Creator and his Creatures. Among the creatures man formed an important species. This species was divided qualitatively for degrees of love. Some philosophers finding positive Love too high for man preached the less ambitious principle of No-Hate. The love of God introduced the anthropomorphic idea of the deity, and eventually to idolatry. Idolatry mixed with idealism produced an interesting combination. The Gita makes the infinite speak from a finite platform, making it difficult for the mass mind to distinguish the finite from the infinite. Hinduism at present stands out as a curious blend, delicious but not very invigorating.

I have said group-life is born of self-assertion and is supported by it. It dies either by the violence of self-assertion or by its growing slackness. Civilisation represents a group-life—it represents the inner meaning of that life. Western civilization in its present condition of decadence reflects both the destructive forces on its face. The violence of self-assertion is clearly visible in the Great War, which seems to have ended, but which in truth has just begun with military music and industrial pageantry. The self-assertion of Germany has pulled it down, while France is intoxicated by its fumes. But self-assertion is ubiquitous in the West in the smallest

mushroom states as well as in the largest established ones. At the same time signs are not wanting to show that self-assertion has been frightened by the fate of Germany and is getting shy. The 'ape and tiger' in the civilised man walks with guarded footsteps as if his old barbaric courage had failed him, almost giving room for suspecting that cowardice is slowly creeping over him in the march of international relations. The future looks like an unknown deep, and no nation seems willing to take a big jump. On the contrary every nation tries to feel its way in the shallow water near the edge of the cutting bank, taking soundings where the depth requires it. At the same time the growing weakness of the principle of self-assertion is visible in another direction. The philosophy of idealism, creating a reality behind appearance, and crying halt to the bacchanalian activity of civilization, is slowly percolating from the higher planes of culture down to the middle planes of intellectual life. If America had been discovered in the twentieth century instead of in the sixteenth, it seems doubtful whether the progress of Western civilization in the new continent would have been as rapid as it has been. Efforts are being made to introduce Western civilization into the swamps and wilds of Central Africa, but the progress is retarted by factors, which had no play in the civilization of America. Obstructive forces are making their appearance from unexpected directions, and however barbarous the squatters and pioneers may be, the Governments at home either do not dare or are sincerely unwilling to follow them to the extent they desire. In Kenya hindrances from India have compelled the European pioneers to recognise, however dimly, the natural rights of the native Africans, who cannot be so easily massacred as the Red Indians in case of unwillingness to sweat for them. Slaves, such as those who were transported in Cargo boats across the Atlantic in the seventeenth and eighteenth century cannot now be imported into the new exploitation. Slaves of the present day are indentured and more costly and therefore less profitable. For the moment being Africa appears to be more thinly populated than the pioneers wish, and their endeavours will have to be directed towards the biological growth of population among the Africans of the East Coast, because the growth of population by immigration is not promising. Exploitation is becoming increasingly difficult all over the world, because the spirit of self-assection is slowly spreading among the weak races. We in

India are disappointed by the Kenya decision. But the pioneers know what mischief India has done. Pioneers do not form plantations to feed the natives or wandering foreigners. They want the pure exploitable stuff, not the mixed rubbish of exploitable exploitives. They hate people who come in the passive, & stay to acquire an activemood in the manipulation of exploitation. I am not justifying their hate. I am not offering any moral criticism, for criticism is futile where the stand point of the critic is different from that of the persons whose activity is criticised. I only say that parasites have an admirable quality, *viz.*, that they hate weaker parasites or sub-parasites springing out of their own creative mismanipulation carried on in an unexamined, unsterilised atmosphere. The conflict of parasites is favourable to the organism in which they grow. The native Africans of Kenya may probably escape the fate of the Red Indians or that of the Negroes who slaved in America on the extirpation of the latter. But it must be remembered that exploitation is not decreasing in magnitude; only it is changing its methods and making itself invisible. Electricity is not less powerful than steam, but it works with greater subtlety. Fraud is not less effective than force, but it often challenges detection. In Western civilization which stands on the bed rock of exploitation, the intellect is a mighty force, that shows itself not merely in the utilisation of the resources of external nature, but in playing upon the weakness of neighbour. Self-consciousness in the exploited neighbour not only means that he has gained positive knowledge of his own rights and capacities, but also acquired the art of detecting the moral weakness of the exploiting agent. When self-consciousness comes to the weak and exploited, there arises a conflict between the two types of morality, morality of the group life and the morality of the individual life, as explained before. In such conflict the practical advocates of group morality weaken their moral position by trying to shift its foundation, which is an impossible task. Such attempt serves to show that group-life itself is losing its vigour—its moral vigour—which has supported it efficiently, in weal and woe, from the beginning of the expliotive process. The world is at this moment in a ferment of self-consciousness and self-assertion brewing in the heart of the world's exploited majority—for ages exploited sexually, economically, politically and theologically. The revolt of women, worker, subject race and the superstitious mass has come simultaneously and has caused a

flutter in the dovecots of vested rights. How this universal revolt will end can not be definitely foretold. The exploitation by the minority of the majority may succeed for a time, but it cannot continue for any length of time. The parasitic minority are being taxed heavily and harassed by strikes and otherwise. Capital is disappearing slowly from the field of exploitation, because exploitation is ceasing to be profitable. Hoarded wealth is being sucked away by burdensome taxation for the material welfare of the hitherto exploited masses. But one thing is certain, *viz.*, that if the whole of the hoarded wealth in the chest of the rich parasites were divided equally among the masses, the latter would not find their pockets perceptibly heavier than now, and they would probably find the sweat on their faces and the anxieties in their hearts growing thicker and beavier than before. Humanity would no doubt have the satisfaction of rowing all in the same boat, but that satisfaction can not continue long, for the boat without a helmsman will not steer in the desired direction, and will run the risk of capsizing in the nearest eddy. What took place before will probably repeat itself and exploitation will begin again on existing lines. Optimism suggests that the conflict of interests which is *disturbing the world to-day can only terminate* by a *drastic* change of ideal and a scheme of life in which bread eating and bread earning will cease to be the ultimate end of it, *i.e.*, by a correct allocation of energies between the material and the spiritual interests of man. In Western civilization and in most of its predecessors the material have engrossed by far the largest part of human activities to the detriment of spiritual interests. The progress science has been making, while it exercises the intellect, is designed mainly to meet the material or physical requirements of human nature. It has first created new phyiscal wants and then tried to gratify them. It is not denied that science has cleared the way to the satisfaction of spiritual wants, but its purpose has been chiefly to find satisfaction for physical wants many of which have the appearance, but generally not the substance, of spiritual wants. What is wanted is a sense of proportion between the value of spiritual satisfaction and physical gratification. There is something inherently evil in Western civilization which turns man's attention to the gratification of the demands of the flesh even when the intention is to provide means for the satisfaction of spiritual wants. It has a tendency to crush the growth of the latter wants and their satisfaction.

Science finds its value in applied science, and knowledge, which does not immediately lead to the gratification of the needs of the flesh, is stigmatized as knowledge for its own sake, *i.e.*, knowledge which provides no satisfaction for human wants, implying either that spiritual wants are not worth the trouble of finding satisfaction for them, or positively deserve to be repressed for their mischievous tendency to withdraw human attention from the needs of the flesh. Philosophy is supposed to be unpragmatic and even positively harmful. A philosopher is spoken of either as a pedantic fool or as a revolutionary miscreant. Of all kinds of philosophy social philosophy is believed to be the most hurtful. It create new ideas and social sentiments and undermines the existing order of society, the empire of the parasites, the dominion of the minority who eat bread in fine toilet over the majority who eat it in the sweat of their faces, and make it crisp for the former. Inspite of all opposition however the new social philosophy which, under the stigma of socialism, preaches submission to god's curse or law to the effect that every man must eat bread in the sweat of his face, is gaining ground from year to year. The great war by breaking the power and prestige of the parasites has greatly helped the new philosophy or social life. The direct and indirect possibilities of future are immense. But it is not within the scope of this essay to deal with them. Suffice it to say that if socialism succeeds in convincing mankind that submission to God's curse or law is the true nature of man, unsophisticated by the allurements of the devil, every Christian heart should feel grateful.

To return to the new tribalism of America. I have said the old tribalism of the old world was associated among other things with slavery. The new tribalism failed in its effort to establish slavery in America. The squatters offered terms of peace to the natives. The natives considered those terms and refused them. They preferred death to slavery—bleeding to sweating for others' bread. They deserved no mercy, they were so stubborn. The colour of their skin was detestable. It reminded one of the colour of blood. They were bloody people. They were blood-thirsty and monstrous. All these and other bad names were given to the liberty-loving, chivalrous natives in order to justify their extirpation. It was not moral sentiment nor intellectual conviction that influenced the judgment of the squatters. They appealed

to might, and gun-powder decided the question. It was not an old type tribal war, in which some men were killed and others enslaved, but it was a war of extermination. Conscience and compunction which probably pricked the old tribes in the massacre of their rivals had been silenced by the difference in the colour of skin, as well as the recalcitrancy of the Red Man. Blood is said to be thicker than water, but the Red Man's blood was lost in the skin and had no thickness inside, and it was shed like water. From the point of view of Western civilization the new settlers acted righteously in extirpating the natives and clearing the ground of all obstructive factors. The latter were weeded like tares in a field newly brought under cultivation. Here depopulation was as meritorious as deforestation subsequently was in the hands of the pioneers who expanded American civilization in the backwoods of the hinterland in the West of the Atlantic Coast. When out of sheer exasperation the Red Indians resorted to heroic retribution, the general massacre that followed was regarded as the debrutalization of the neighbourhood; and when the retribution was of an unheroic character the ensuing massacre was carried on as a process of deratization in a cargo boat. Christian forgiveness was lost in a sea of monstrous misdeeds. In the middle of the last century Darwin and a number of other infidels, sanctified these colossal cruelties, by proclaiming the law of the survival of the fittest as the foundation on which western civilization was built, and in which it was maintained in the erect posture. Herbert Spencer, the Chief apostle of the theory of evolution, was very fond of casting aspersions on Christians, particularly on bishops and on the hierarchy of Christian officialdom, by calling attention to the incitement and support given by them to the cruelties practised in the New World. But he did not see clearly that if the bishops were civilized the evolutionists also were Christians. A sweet but poisonous blend of Natural selection and Christian charity has been causing fermentive indigestion in the heart of every civilized Christian. Western civilization is now on the parting of ways. It must either firmly adhere to idealistic Christianity or openly declare for the continuity of biological evolution in the progress of civilisation. To believe that this evolution turns cruelty into charity by the magic of slowness attended with steadiness seems too much for the common mind. The evolution of charity out of cruelty, of love out of hate, is more unthinkable than the identification of unity and trinity.

Huxley takes a bolder course when he declares civilization as a force which works by actively and openly opposing the law of Natural selection. The European settlers who have turned Red India into White America were either Christians or evolutionists by anticipation. But I think they were a mixture of both. They had the impulse of the law of the survival of the fittest, while they had on their lips the wisdom of the catechumen. The truth seems to be that they were following the morality of the individual, and the morality of the group life at the same time. The last morality is the morality of the law of evolution, the morality of self-assertion and brutish might, and the morality of the survival of the fittest. As Chrisitan individuals they offered to teach the gospel of love to the heathens, and helped them in diverse ways to improve their worldly condition. But the natives did not trust them, bluntly refused to sweat for them and gladly accepted the sentence of death without asking for a commutation to slave-life for themselves and posterity. They valued liberty more than life. The first was in their eye permanent and real. The second was shadowy and short-lived. They did not fight for liberty. They simply died for it. The world might have been spared many ugly scenes of prolonged suffering on the one hand and moral monstrosities on the other if the settlers were either pure Christians or pure evolutionists. The settlers consisted of three classes of men, *viz.*, (1) those who had failed at home to live by the sweat of others. (2) those who had failed to live because they refused to sweat for others and (3) those who had failed to obtain a livelihood even by sweating for others. They all consisted of failures. In their new home having failed to compel the natives to sweat for them, and having out of mixed anger and avarice, extirpated the latter, the settlers began to show the real superiority of their character by assuming the courage of despair, and setting their shoulders to tasks of unspeakable and unthinkable difficulty. They got themselves earnestly to make the impossible possible. They cleared the woods, brought them under cultivation, built houses and churches, roads and drains, made gardens and play grounds, while their women accepted maternity freely and profusely, so that in a short space of time jungles were turned into smiling villages. Prosperous villages grew into cities, and civilization smiled brighter than in the European homes. Population grew fast by new immigration as well as by the natural process. Who can regret the darkness of the past while living in the light of

the present? Who ventures to condemn the depopulation of the Red Indians when he fully realises the achievements of the new population? The only thing that comes uppermost in the unsophisticated mind is that destruction precedes genuine constructive efforts, that it is folly to adhere to the existing order when a brighterorder has sprung up in the imaginative consciousness of man, to uphold the defeated past in the name of conservatism, and law and order, when the conquering future is marching with the strength and steadiness of a skilled and disciplined army? The old population of America has been swept away and replaced by a new. Hunting life has been ended by the introduction of the full blaze of civilization. If progress is the law of nature, it has been fully illustrated in America. But alas! It was not the Christian pioneers alone who by their unaided effort effected the whole progress. They carried it up to the point where prosperous villages sparng up outof the jungles. Later progress has a different history!

The descendants of the pioneers not contented with their happy village life, lived in fair prosperity, prayer and spiritual promise, listened to the devil that suggested the introduction of Negro slavery. The more well-to-do among the villagers became adventurous. They bought slaves from the Spaniards and the English traders, and started agriculture on a large scale. Cotton and tobacco were the staples produced. These were not food, and were not required for the consumption of the local people, but for export and for exchange for precious metals. The Africans were kidnapped from their homes by ruffians and monsters, transported like cargo across the Atlantic and settled on plantations to eat bread in the sweat of their faces, to sweat for the benefit of their masters, who wanted cakes, not bread, who wanted fine garments not coarse clothes; who wanted palaces not ordinary houses; who wanted stables, horses, equipages and hounds, pleasure yachts and large bank accounts.

Christ said, "a man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." The American adventurers read this as "man shall not live by bread alone, but he shall eat cakes also". He lives by the word of God, but he prospers by the word of the devil. No wonder when the devil took them up into the high mountain of prosperity and showed them the kingdom of the world and the glory of them, they fell at his feet

and prayed for his guidance so that they might possess and improve upon them. Negro slavery was whispered into their ears, and American villages were turned into cities. I shall not enter upon a discussion of this new slavery at any length beyond calling attention to two facts, *viz.*, (1) That this slavery did not originate in the design of the master to have bread (or mere necessaries of life) baked by the sweat of the slaves, and (2) that the skin of the slaves had a different pigment. Cruelty to slaves in the old regime was generally tempered by compassion ; in the new regime this compassion was conspicuous by its absence. The new slaves were not treated like men in any sense, except in the sense that they had the form of human beings and could be made to work like them. They were superior to draught cattle & more useful as instruments for the promotion of civilization. They had no soul, because they were not Christian. Therefore the brotherhood preached by Christ had no application to them. They had an economic value, and were worth preserving to the extent of that value, and no more. They were bought and sold at the market, and the price represented their exact value in the currency of the time. They formed part of the capital of business, and their value underwent depreciation with wear and tear. Medical charges were like payments made for repair of machinery. If they received kind treatment, as sometimes they did, they received it as tonic, designed to create a higher value. Food was given on the same principle as fodder ; and briefly, in all the relations which the master bore to them he calculated the cost of production and market value as the owner of living mutton, who spends money on grain calculates it. The principles of political economy, of the dismal Science of Carlyle, formed the foundation of the moral relations between masters and slaves. The slaves were often stupid enough to distinguish between moraly good and morally bad masters, as some Indians distinguish between one high official and another, but the truth is that the good master was as a rule a better businessman, probably more solvent, and therefore more capable of distinguishing between long run and short run profits. Slavery was ultimately abolished not because Western civilization had turned a new leaf in the principles of morality, but because sound economic calculation showed that slave labour was injurious to the industrial progress of civilization. Bishop Wilberforce and other devoted Christians exulted in the abolition ; and statesmen and economists openly applauded them as if they had

saved civilization from the imputation of being Anti-Christian at heart. The devil's creation was fathered upon Christ, for it was the devil that suggested the abolition and accomplished it. Similar camouflage is associated with the solicitude of the British Government for the religion of the Hindus, who swell the railway revenue by distant pilgrimages, frequently undertaken. Counting by the number of pilgrims who annually travel by railways and by the amount of revenue paid by them, Hinduism is making rapid strides towards expansion and depth ; A glorious unreality !

THE DISMAL DEVIL'S GLARE IN THE DARK—V.

THE ETHICS OF WESTERN CIVILIZATION.

In the preceding Section I have dwelt upon external exploitation as an effective instrument for the evasion of the curse of Adam. This exploitation was not accidentally suggested by any definite historical event. It was no doubt facilitated by the discoveries of Columbus, but it was not suggested by them. The people of Western Europe even before the birth of Western civilization, had been thinking of possible exploitation in unknown lands, or lands but dimly known. The pressure of population, the 'devil's remedy for the cure of stagnating idleness, and his chief instrument for advancing civilization, was working its way along new lines, and instead of trying to subject the natural resources of their own countries to improved forms of exploitation the people of Western Europe thought of exploitation in other countries, for the exploitation of neighbour has always been considered to be easier and nobler than the exploitation of nature.

The countries in the East were inaccessible by a direct water route, while the land route was effectively barred by the terrible followers of the prophet, who had expanded into Eastern Europe right up to the centre of Austrian territory. Columbus having assured himself that the earth was a globe came to the conclusion that continual sailing along a longitudinal circle must either take

the ship to new land, or bring it round back to the port of departure. He selected the circle which, he supposed, passed through the territories of Kublai Khan, where the people were rich and had things to spare. Columbus had no clear idea what course exploitation should actually take in the new land or in the old land to be rediscovered. A few days' sojourn among the people of Guanahana enabled him to form a definite plan. That plan was (1) to rob the natives of their accumulated wealth, and (2) to make them work for the advantage of the adventurers by amicable methods, or to enslave them by force or (3) to extirpate them. Columbus was not the only man who thought of these methods of exploitation. All the maritime nations of Western Europe formed similar plans, and the more powerful among them had conceived a supplementary method, by which the wealth gathered by the nation would be pirated by another.

It will thus appear that external exploitation has a history of its own and it sprang out of a psychology which had been developing for centuries in the mind and heart of the people who represent Western civilization in flesh and blood to-day. Western civilization has evolved out of primitive pragmatism, with a slight orientation imparted to it by Christanity. Its Ethics is the Ethics of primitive pragmatism slightly muddled and weakened by the teachings of Christ, but not purified or improved by it, as many suppose. The ten Commandments of the Holy Bible have their counterpart, somewhat varied in the Bible of primitive pragmatism. They are (1) Love and assert thyself; (2) Hate thy neighbour as deeply as thou lovest thyself; (3) Trust nobody (4) Thou shalt eat bread well buttered if possible in the sweat of the faces of thy neighbours or at least try to eat it in that way; (5) Worship thy tribe as thy God and feel contempt for all other tribes; (6) Thy native land is at the centre of the world, and thou must revere it as such; (7) Thou shalt commit no murder except when love for thyself, thy tribe or thy country requires it, and so forth. As primitive pragmatism advanced into civilization supplementary commandments have been added. One of them is—speak the truth, but never the whole truth, and conceal as much as you can manage to. This commandment, intelligently followed, enables man to reveal the appearance of truth and conceal the reality. Its utility appears in deception, without which our ancient forbears could scarcely

have triumphed over their neighbours of the brute kingdom with their tougher muscles and stronger bones. All civilized people in the East as well as in the West practise deception down to the present day against rats and fishes for the progress of civilization. The rat trap and the fish bait are symbols of civilized truthfulness, which nobody ever thinks of reprobating, for civilization has been rendered possible by these traps and baits and camouflage, that is, by truth revealing only the appearance of reality. The measure of success attained by each camouflage succeeds in allaying suspicion. It begins to decline when people begin to see beneath the surface and to read between the lines when camouflage is met by distrust and suspicion. We are assured by the authority of the present Prime Minister of England that "diabolical suspicion" is retarding the progress of the salvaging of Western Civilization after the great war. But suspicion is older than camouflage, and it appears probable that camouflage after playing its part in the progress of civilization has exhausted its efficiency and that civilization, if it is to advance further, must depend more and more upon naked truth. The suspicion aroused by uncloaked untruthfulness is less pernicious and persistent than what is created by the repercussion of camouflage. The ten commandments of the Holy Bible are known to all. They directly contradict the commandments of primitive pragmatism, or the aboriginal impulses of human nature. Moses did not create them. He received them from Jahveh, that is, from a source higher than ordinary human nature. He had gathered them from wisdom built upon experience. In the progress of social life there comes a time when the unrestricted exercise of the primitive impulses, instead of advancing that life tends to give it a backward turn. It is then that wise men begin to search for new guiding principles of conduct. They find it difficult to propound principles, exactly suited to the circumstances or to the degree of progress already attained—principles calculated to give the maximum acceleration to social advancement. So from one extreme they run to the other. Herbert Spencer would, if possible, have framed separate sets of rules for the guidance of conduct, suited to each grade of social advance. But he found that impossible, and contented himself with laying down general principles which he supposed to be suited to the general condition of European Society in the second half of the nineteenth century. His principles were intended to be applied to conduct between Europeans and Indians or between

specifically excluded from these principles conduct between Europeans and Indians or between Europeans and Negroes, that is to say, to social intercourse between men of two distinct grades of advance, for which he had no cut and dried scheme of ethical guidance. He left such intercourse to be guided by the discretion of the superior man, that is, of the man with superior strength of brain and brawn. In a manner Herbert Spencer left ethics in the same condition in which he found it. The only noticeable fact in his *Principles of Ethics* is the attempt he made to clothe Pragmatism with an under-vest of psychological evolution. A study of his principles of ethics points to the conclusion that no immutable moral laws can be wisely left to guide the conduct of mutable man. The nature of man at any given stage of social progress is an unknown quantity, and the best conduct suited to that stage must remain indeterminate also. Man either blunders into civilization or blunders out of it. He has no principles of ethics to guide him.

That the commandments of the Holy Bible have never been conformed to even approximately is known to all. They represent ideals,—ultimate ideals,—the terminal stage in the moral progress of man. The term 'terminal stage' is objectionable because it sets a limit to the moral progress of man, and advanced pragmatists repudiate it. But we may hold that the ideal is very remote for practical purposes. Man is drifting up and down in the great current of progress with its back washes some where midway between the stages to which the commandments of primitive pragmatism and of the Holy Bible respectively would accurately apply. The velocity of a stream flowing from the hills down to the sea varies at each stage of its progress. The progress of the moral life varies in its speed in the different stages of its course : We may generally assume that the progress is very slow at first ; and steadily receives new acceleration with each advance towards the ideal. We may take it that the velocity of progress varies inversely as the distance from the ideal. The question for my present purpose is, what was the stage of moral progress at which Europe had arrived in the sixteenth century when the more adventurous among its people came in contact with the original population of America, now, by the irony of fate, called the aboriginal population.

The Ethics of the New Testament were prematurely superimposed upon the unwritten commandments of primitive pragmatism

in the West of Europe by what may be regarded as an unnatural accident. In the advanced Roman Empire, where Peter and Paul preached, the teachings of Christ found an agreeable soil in the prevailing stoicism and platonic idealism of the early centuries. There a civilized people were Christianized. It was a process of conversion that the apostles undertook in Greece and Rome. Among the primitive races of the North-West the Roman Monks found no pre-existing civilization. There Christanity had to face the problem of creation. The people were in need more of civilization than of Christianity. The Monks gave the people more of civilization than of Christanity. Spirituality had to be created as well as intellectuality and morality. Flesh and blood reigned supreme; and the interests of flesh and blood were the interests of humanity in this region of the world. The teachings of Christ never percolated beneath the subsoil, and just as the spiritual and moral subsoil was being prepared there arose a new aggressive force on the borders of the so called Christian world. Christainity became a mere slogan, fortified by the incursions of Islam which threatened Europe from East and West not as a missionary force, but as a flesh and blood power shortly after the monks had begun work in earnest. Love for the neighbour was at once drowned in the surging sea of hate for the Mussalman. Christianity kept Islam at arm's length, not by the power of love but by the power of hate which leavened primitive pragmatism and gave it the fragrance and flavour of semi-social life. It was a fortunate thing for Christianity that it had not yet succeeded in making any deep impression among the pagan pragmatists of the wilderness of Europe. Otherwise the followers of the Prophet might have crushed to death the youthful giant—that spirit which now rules the World in the name of Western Civilization. The course of history would probably have taken a different turn if Islam had spread over entire Europe, instead of being driven back from the centre of it. It is impossible to say what that history would have been for the World; but this much is certain that it would have been different from what it is and what it has been. Faith and fanaticism are supreme in the Islamic countries even now; and though Greek philosophy made some impression upon the cultured people among the followers of the prophet, reason has always been subordinated to faith in practical life, specially in international and intertribal affairs.

The progress of real Christianity was thus nipped in the bud by the aggressions of Islam, and primitive pragmatism kept its robustness untouched by it. During the middle ages, the whole of which was occupied by the wars of the Crusades, the teachings of Christ had very little chance of making a deep impression. Love was seldom lost upon neighbour, and hate reigned supreme. Christian Europe as a whole was at war with Islam ; and the different countries of Europe were at war with one another. Peace seldom intervened long enough to enable the teachings of Christ to take root in the heart of man. People loved Christ for the sword to which he had referred in down-right humour. They did not love him as the prince of peace—a title afterwards conferred on him by subtle theology.

By an irony of fate it was Saracen Civilization that mellowed the barbaric life of the West. The Christians and Mussalmans, encamped near each other in Palestine, carried on social intercourse which enabled the former to imbibe principles of civilized life from the superior culture of the latter. It was thus that Islam by repercussion diffused the spirit of Christ, though but slightly, among people who were baptised with the water of the Jordan, but were never prepared by repentance or otherwise for the kingdom of God which Christ had come to establish on Earth. Among other things Islam gave a new turn to Christianity by suggesting to the Pope the value of a Khalifa and of theocratic rule. The Pope consolidated his spiritual power with the cement of secular power. He became the Suzerain of Western Europe, and Christianity became slowly converted into Catholicism, with all its secular strength and spiritual weakness. Western Europe became for four centuries united under one ruler feared by kings as kings by feudal vassals.

The middle ages were brought to a close by a unique concatenation of events, *viz.*, the renascence, the reformation, the discovery of the printing press and the discovery of America. The renascence substituted advanced Greek pragmatism for the primitive pragmatism of Western Europe, and weakened the force of official Christianity. It superimposed Greek intellectualism on the medieval brain of a people emerging from superstition and the trammels of traditions. It produced a psychological combination unparalleled in histroty. It was an amalgamation of the hellenism of the age of Homer and the pragmatism of the age of Pericles and Protagorus,

with a feeble streak of Christianity running through it Trade, commerce, navigation and adventure received a new impetus.

This was the psychology of Europe when her people began to sail across the Atlantic, ostensibly in the name of Christianity and Civilization, but really with the Bible of pragmatism reinforced by recently invented gun powder and muzzle loader in their hands, for the economic exploration and exploitation of the new world. They went with the knowledge (1) that the country to which they were going was inhabited, (2) that the inhabitants were inferior both physically and intellectually, (3) that they would have to be dislodged from part of the land, and deprived of part of their rights in a larger area, (4) that they would have to be compelled to work for the benefit of the settlers if they refused voluntarily to do so, (5) that they would have to be organized into an amalgamated economic society and behave in ways dictated to them in accordance with the principles of social advance, and (6) that they would have to be extirpated if they showed persistent stubbornness in refusing civilization and its mode of life, or in other words, if they refused to sign the social contract prepared on Hobbesian principles or to live up to it afterwards.

The result of the contact of Western Europe with Eastern America is well-known. The Atlantic Ocean has been virtually obliterated from the surface of the globe, and America now forms to all intents and purposes an expansion or accretion of Europe towards the west. The old inhabitants are annihilated, and the present ethnography of America is nearly the same as that of Europe. England has its counter part in New England, and London has its replica in New York. America is to-day as civilized as Europe, and, as a matter of fact, now stands at the head of the civilized world in science and politics, in industry and commerce. The likeness of Europe and America, and their relation to the rest of the world is sometimes emphasised by the newly coined term Eur-America, which makes as if Europe and America were parts of the same continent, the Atlantic Ocean forming the connecting link, not the separating gulf, between them.

Very few people now think it worth while to examine the process by which this new continent (of Eur-America) has been formed as an unified concept. On the contrary most pious people, bewildered by the contradiction between methods and results, try to forget the

loathsome uglinesses of the past in the exuberance of the beauties of the present.

Professor Sidgwick says (page 322, *Elements of Politics*), "the wretched details of ferocity and treachery which have marked the conduct of civilized men in their relations with savages forms one of the most painful chapters in modern history." He might have escaped much of this poignancy if he could have made up his mind to substitute "powerful savages" for "civilized men" in the above passage, and added the epithet "intellectually weak" to "savages." This substitution would have reflected the state of things more accurately, and would have made the process of the transformation of America more intelligible. Western civilization had just started in life when the possibility of external exploitation was opened out to it. Four centuries have since elapsed, and Western civilization has undoubtedly undergone some change during this long period of its life, both morally and intellectually. To call the adventurer of the sixteenth century "civilized men" is to forget the distinction between the childhood and manhood of civilization. Scientifically speaking the transformation of America has been possible because the adventurous colonists were savages just emerging into the first glimpses of civilization. If the transfiguration were undertaken in the twentieth century instead of in the sixteenth, its success would have been less rapid and more doubtful. Many factors which hampered the progress of American Civilization have grown stronger during these centuries. Among these factors international jealousy fortified by the progress of destructive weapons and increasing density of population is the strongest. Sympathy for the weak, though still very feeble in the face of growing love of self, was much feebler in the sixteenth century. Public opinion, that is, the collective psychology of the civilized people, having gathered elements of idealistic morality from far Eastern sources as well as from the teachings of Christ, made available by the printing press and a thirst for true knowledge, has also grown cautious, and to a large extent obstructive to progress on old lines. Public opinion is getting confused in the crucible of practical life, specially of group-life, by the boiling of an impossible mixture of pragmatism, idealism, and naturalism in morality, and of agnosticism, atheism, monotheism and polytheism in religion. Faith is decaying with the growth of rationalism, and fanaticism is declining with the progress

of prevision. The desire to avoid danger is stronger than the desire for progress. With this confused psychology, the adventurers of the sixteenth, the seventeenth and the eighteenth century would have found themselves baffled at every step in progress by internal as well as external forces. The hampering power of internal forces did not trouble them at all, and external forces were much weaker than now. Briefly speaking, the 'ape and tiger' qualities were still fresh in them. They are getting old and rusty now, though in Eastern eyes they seem to retain much of their ancient robustness.

Three kinds of opinion regarding the achievements of Western civilization in the new world are entertained, *viz.*, (1) pragmatic, (2) idealistic (3) mixed. Pragmatic opinion has no fault to find with the course of history in America. The heroes lived upto their faith. Idealistic opinion finds the achievements, though superficially gaudy, to be rotten at the core, and expects that the future will reveal their rottenness, and create repentance where triumph is at the present the ruling feeling. Mixed opinion regards the history of the atrocities and treacheries of the last four centuries as the history of an advantageous course of rascality (like the conquest of Sindh, described by Napier), which has wrested a continent fresh from Nature's hands to adorn it with the highest beauties of Art and Civilization. The aphorism 'good cometh out of evil' has meaning only in the expanded form, 'the good of the strong cometh out of the evil of the weak,' on which Natural selection, and the theory of the survival of the fittest is founded. Western subtlety distinguishes between the good of the individual and the good of society, and thereby evades the enigma of benefit arising out of injury, celestial morality evolving out of infernal diabolicity, and real civilization flowing from brutish animalism. Darwin has done much to clarify and reinvigorate primitive pragmatism, but the incursions of eastern idealism, though probably not so strong as Darwinism, is still gathering strength. The time may come when either of the two will ultimately triumph, and then and not till then can man form any clear definite idea of the future of mankind. Western Civilization is a stream with a strong back-wash, and man is drifting up and down. The back-wash is the creation of the stream itself. Is it possible to conceive of a stream of civilization that has no back-wash? The civilization of *pravritti* ends in the triumph of *nivritti*, while the civilization of *nivritti* leads to

inanity and banality of stagnation in which the larvae of *pravritti* make their appearance again like anopheles, powerless for good, but effective agents of malaria and concomitant evils. Between self-assertion and self-abnegation, there can be no rational compromise ; and judgment upon conduct from either standpoint is likely to be unsatisfactory. Man has hitherto followed diverse mixtures of the two courses of morality, in the ancient world and the modern world, in the East and the West, and their results have been also a mixture of good and evil, rolling and changing in taste and temperature in the gyrating gulf-stream of time.

In dwelling upon the progress of Western civilization in America, and on the methods by which it has expanded and elevated itself I confess my inability to do justice to the completeness of the idea which oppresses my heart, because we are by nature accustomed to think of a country and its people as an associated whole, and not as separable entities. Perhaps the tyranny of words is at the bottom of my feelings. Abstractions and concrete realities are getting inextricably interwoven with each other. The whole and its parts are also getting fused and confused. The distinction between majority and minority is becoming foggy and obscure by the invisible manipulation of time : the majority of to-day is the minority of to-morrow, and *vice versa.*

One race has replaced another in other parts of the world in prehistoric ages by the processes of enslavement and extermination. But the case of America is unparalleled. Here the original people have been annihilated with such unhistoric, inhuman rapidity, with such premeditated, organized and systematic civlized brutality, conscious and purposeful in its character and activity, that our Eastern sentiments are bewildered by the phenomenon, dazzled and stupefied by its monstrous effulgence. The fact that the phenomenon has taken place within the historic period, and for that matter within the proudest period of history, and that the most civilized people took the most prominent part, not merely in the brighter constructive aspect of the phenomenon, but more deeply and deliberately in the darker destructive aspect of it, adds to our bewilderment. The thing is morally unthinkable, and intellectually unrealizable unless we regard civilization as a dragon—a monstrous pterodactyl, biologically extinct, but resurrected in spirit for the construction of a celestial pandemonium on earth.

A unique feature of the phenomenon lies in the fact that the new population of the new Continent consists of two irreconcileable types of races, *viz.*, the White-Aryan and the Black-Negro. How the two foreign colours came to be mixed up in the same locality, while the indigenous colours of the continent were conspicuous by their absence? If the black came to spite the white why did not the latter smite it dead ere it was too late. There are white people who would fain get rid of the black Negro by expatriation or extirpation. But they are in the minority. They lynch the black when the blood is up. They are afraid of murder in cold blood. They loathe the old open type of massacre, and they make the best of a bad business by resorting to subtle modes of exploitation. The thing seems mysterious, and we are almsot tempted to think that the psychology of Western civilization has received a drastic orientation by the subtle influence of time and experience. Some change has possibly taken plaće in it, but the Bible of primitive pragmatism and its decalogue remain substantially the same as before. The same love of self, the same hatred of neighbour, the same desire to eat buttered bread in the sweat of other peoples' faces, the same instinct and impulses still rule the heart. Only the mellowing influence of reason and prevision of insight, foresight and farsight is changing their modes of expression.

Is the black Negro a better man than the red Indian? The question is a philosophic puzzle. What constitutes goodness? The knife is good that cuts the pen-stick. Herbert Spencer says something of this kind in his *Principles of Ethics*. The goodness of a thing is judged by the manner in which it fulfils the purpose for which it is made. What was the purpose for which the red Indian or the black Negro was made? Ask the average civilized man of the West and he will at once tell you that both were made to sweat for the white man; and Herbert Spencer's answer to the question, who is the better of the two, will at once suggest that the Negro was better than the Indian. This is how the black Negro still survives while the red Indian has been rejected and extirpated. The law of Natural selection preserves the useful and destroys the harmful. Pragmatism based upon purpose makes the same answer. The civilized men who went to America to develop Western civilization gave the same answer in an emphatic manner. There can be no other answer as conclusive if the premise as given above, is correct. There are men who doubt the correctness of the premise.

There are men who think the red Indian was a better man than the black Negro for the very reason that he proved useless, even harmful to the whiteman, while the Negro proved useful and good. In course of time a change came over the Negro. He did not change his character ; but circumstances enabled the white man to find a more useful instrument for his purpose. He rejected the black man in the name of emancipation and transferred his functions to his white brother, whom the Dismal Devil had made poor and seek employment.

THE WILL-TO-COMMAND AND THE POWER-TO-COMMAND.

I have defined the ethics of Western civilization in the shape of a decalogue, the first commandment of which is "Love and assert thyself," and the second is, "Hate thy neighbour as deeply as thou lovest thyself." These commandments, it may be supposed, are open to criticism in several ways. In the first place love of self is common to human nature all the world over, and so is also hate for neighbour. In the second place hate for neighbour is mixed with sympathy, and in many cases it is difficult to say which of the two preponderates. Thus Western civilization, it may be said, does not stand by itself. The ethics, commendable or reproachable, are shared by it with other civilizations, ancient or modern. Again self-assertion is not necessarily a concomitant of self-love,—and in Western civilization self-assertion is, and until lately has generally been, limited to a small minority of the social aggregate, and that civilization has advanced more by self-negation or self-submission than by self-assertion, that is to say, 'obedience' more than 'will' has been the dominating factor in that civilization more emphatically than in other civilizations. This last is the secret discovered by H. G. Wells. It is necessary to explain that 'obedience' is also 'will'. It means 'will to obey' while 'will' as used by Wells means 'will to command' : The question which of the two wills creates the other or whether they are co-existent is rather difficult to answer. Sociology has not yet definitely found the solution. It is probable that both the wills were present in human nature from the beginning in an inchoate state, and that they have slowly developed by the pressure of environment, after their bifurcation ; that is to say, that the will to command has developed in some, while the will to obey has developed in others in a direct ratio. The

law of heredity has helped the evolution of the two wills in different parts of society. The bifurcation is comparable to the multifurcation of the senses which have afterwards developed in different degrees in different species. Taking a single individual for consideration, the will to command has grown in proportion as the will to obey has declined, and conversely. Thus society became divided into two parts in one of which the will to command was immensely strong and the will to obey was equally weak, while in the other evolution proceeded in the reverse direction. This double development in the two parts of society lies at the root of co-operation without which there can be no civilization. The society in which every man wishes to command is doomed. The society in which every man wishes to obey has no future before it. The society in whch every man is equally willing to command and to obey is also on the way to ruin, for his double development is meaningless, and only indicates invertibrateness.

There is another psychological element essential for social progress, *viz.*, the 'power-to-command.' This power is primarily intellectual with a moral undercurrent. Thus the intellect, the will and the emotions are all combined to constitute the living source from which springs civilization. The energy of muscles is also necessary, but this energy must be universal, and the more equally distributed it is the better for the society running for progress.

The conditions of social progress are thus : (1) A definite ratio between those who possess the will to command and those who possess the will to obey, (2) coincidence between the will to command and the power to command. If those who have the will to command do not possess the power to command the result is disastrous. If those who have the power to command lack the will to command, the result will be unsatisfactory if their lack of will to command renders it necessary to invite men of inferior power to the position of command. A disproportion between those who have the will to command and those who have the will to obey is specially disastrous when the numerator goes on increasing and the denominator keeps decreasing. The proportion which is most beneficial changes with the condition of society, and in a progressive society the very fact of progress makes the change necessary. Civilization is meaningless if it is not dynamic. It will thus appear that civilization is a delicate machine, which requires perpetual attention, there being

more chances of its going wrong than of its going right. Every new phenomenon creates new forces and chances, and every new generation must overhaul it thoroughly to grapple with the effects of new changes, if adverse, and to reinforce them if they are helpful. For example in Western Society the will to command is increasing both in intensity and in expansion. The will to obey is imperceptibly decreasing in both directions. The progress of external exploitation and of general education leading to the growth of democratic ideas in politics, and of the idea of equal rights in economics, *i.e.*, in industry and commerce, have largely prepared the ground for disruptive forces with which statesmen find it difficult to grapple. The labour movement, with all its implications, is largely prompted by the will to command springing up in quarters in which half a century ago the will to obey resided in its pristine purity. The self-assertion which characterises the movement carried beneath its cloak of equality and fraternity the dagger of the will to command, and the will to enforce retributive justice by compelling those who have so far commanded to obey for sometime at least those whom they have unjustly commanded for untold ages. This has been accomplished in Russia, where retribution has been as drastic as the injustice of ages. Vested interest in other countries, anticipating the vindictive retributive self-assertion is steadily making recessions to which they give the name of concessions to keep up the old appearance of superiority, ennobled by generosity. But the reality is now and again popping out. What will really happen in the long run over Western civilization as a whole cannot be accurately or with certitude predicted ; but this much is more than probable that the new social order will be different from the existing order and that the new civilization will be substantially, as well as in form different from what we now call Western civilization

I have said that a society in which every man is equally willing to command and to obey is on the way to ruin, because equality of strength in the two wills in the same person indicates nervous debility, and comparative indifference to social life. Both the wills in such cases are feeble and lethargic. But in every society there is a large section composed of this type of hybrids, living in the middle planes of society. They act as connecting links and are beneficial to society in the earlier stages of the progress of inequality. They

are a danger to such society when they outgrow in volume their legitimate limits, causing a disproportion between those who command and those who obey. There is in the amalgamation of the wills in the same person a moral poison of the nature of hypocrisy and treachery, though the two wills separately function in opposite directions. The amalgamation facilitates the progress of equality in a society striving for increased inequality, as its spinal column. This middle class is expanding in the Western countries beyond legitimate limits. The energy of will either to command or to obey is decreasing with the result that the most advanced nations are declining in power and prestige. The coming equality which is divorced from fraternity, and is nourished by intellectuality is carrying in its bosom the elements of mutual aloofness more than the forces of active disruption,—the elements of non-co-operation more than the forces of aggressive opposition. Mutual distrust and diabolical suspicion rule the hearts of men in all social and international affairs. Capital is getting shy, and labour prefers unemployment to existing conditions of work. Profits are declining, and wages are increasing—a state of things which indicates that exploitation which has made civilization possible is losing its motive force and sustaining energy.

The will and power to command which create, expand and strengthen, in its proper sphere, the will to obey have been more highly developed in the West by the strength of the resistance which they met with in what is known as the struggle for existence, but what is really a struggle for ascendancy. This struggle for existence, in the case of man, is more a struggle for the position of command than for mere subsistence. In the West climate and soil were in the beginning enemies rather than friends. They resisted, more than they helped, man to find food and clothing in requisite amplitude and necessitated a harder fight between neighbour and neighbour. Grabbing and grinding, pillaging and ploughing, plundering and producing,—both met with strong resistence. But on the whole grinding seemed more difficult and disagreeable than grabbing. Military co-operation developed farther than industrial co-operation. Industrial co-operation had in a manner to be created by military co-operation. Victory in war produced slaves and slaves produced commodities. In Greece free men fought and slaves produced. In Athens alone twenty-one thousand free men were served by four

hundred thousand slaves. I believe there were fifty thousand overseers or links to keep the slaves bound to their masters. At all events free men found it easier to enslave than to slave, to compel a neighbour to obey than to coerce nature to respond. In the East on the contrary nature was easily responsive, and neighbour when pressed did not show much resistance. It was thus that men belonging to the same stock migrating to different climates, different latitudes, longitudes and altitudes, developed civilization of different types (in which the exploitation of neighbour and the exploitation of nature were mixed up in different proportions) in different ages instead of developing it simultaneously. The Western Aryans were the latest in developing their civilization, but when they did develop it they developed it with greater fulness. They have had besides the advantage of the experience of civilizations that had preceded their own. Western civilization is not Eastern civilization elongated or developed in a direct line, though it has had the advantage of working with the experience gathered by the latter both in progress and decline. It has borrowed much from Greek civilization, and now the principles of Indian and Chinese civilization are insensibly creeping over it. They have not yet succeeded in changing the foundation of its structure, but they have slightly affected the latter. Western Civilization still retains in full vigour its military type though her industries have advanced more fully than in any other civilization. The industrial and the military character of the civilization are mutually helpful, but the industrial definitely holds a subordinate position to the military character. Comparative peace during the second half of the nineteenth century led philosophers to suppose that civilization had definitely changed its type. That illusion has however now completely disappeared. The twentieth century promises to be pre-eminently a century of militarism, not one of constructive industrialism. All its inventions so far have been directed to the facilitation of war and destruction.

The expansion of Western civilization over latitudes and climates different from those in which it originally started life, and in which it has mainly developed, is unfavourable to its further growth, that is to say, growth in its own line. Through foreign influence working directly through the contact with the Jews in Europe and indirectly by the facility of acquiring it, afforded by contact with civilization the love of wealth has developed enormously in western civilization. Opinion is divided as to whether the love of wealth

has already out-stripped the love of power or the will to command. If however progress continues in its present line for sometime more, the love of wealth will definitely overpower the love of power, and there are already signs visible on the horizon which indicate that in some small parts of Western society the love of wealth has reached undesirable dimensions.

When climate, soil and neighbour are all docile, the power to command has very little play. With the power to command the will to command declines also, and this state of things, if continued for a long time, must lead to enervation and love of relaxation. The influence of the expansion of Western civilization all over the heathen world, which is a glorious fact in its history to-day, will have its due share in its ultimate destruction. The repercussion of its contact with alien civilizations is bound to show itself in new orientations and change of pivotal principles. Two civilizations cannot live in close contact for any length of time without mutual infection. The evil produced on the weaker civilization may be more direct and immediate, but that which affects the stronger partner is more injurious in its ultimate effect.

If the struggle for existence against climate, soil and neighbour is the underlying life-principle of Western civilization it cannot ultimately gain by the relaxation of that struggle, caused by favourable climate and soil and readily obeying neighbours. India has placed at the disposal of Britain a vast continent, with a climate that dispenses with the burning of coal at night and the costly rearing of woolly cattle, with a soil that responds profusely to the scratching stimuli of the ancient unchanging plough-share, and teeming with a population in whom the will to command is now conspicuous by its absence. The situation is, in its immediate effect, fascinating for Britain. But its ultimate effect must be ruinous to her The poet said "Rule Britannia rule the waves," not the calm sea. The will and power to command India are much weaker now than they were before. They have been demoralized, debauched, devitalized by long continued fair-weather navigation. The ship has long sailed fast and true in direction. The rudder and the propeller though they have long been rusting have had very little attention directed to them, for they seemed to be getting superfluous. The ship seemed capable of dispensing with them. A cloud no bigger than a man's hand, and a gale no stronger than an

evening breeze of summer have set the whole thing out of gear. The bureaucracy is dreadfully afraid of the little stream of opposition which has appeared in the shape of Non-Co-operation. It ought to have welcomed it as a tonic for its relaxing constitution, instead of looking upon it as a destructive force with consternation. The Brightest Service in the world seems to have been utterly forsaken by its brightness, by its will and power to command, and as the difficulty of commanding has increased, a large percentage of civil servants in a diffident, despondent mood quitted the service on proportionate pension. They failed to appreciate the national value of the problem, and far from putting their shoulders to the task of grappling with environment found wisdom in retiring to a life of ease and repose, from the field of battle where they had opportunities of achieving higher glories for the good of a vast aggretion of mankind, for the progress of humanity as a whole. Their patriotism running into communal and personal lines taught them the value of discretion as the better part of valour. Such civil servants as adhered to the service did not generally do so out of confidence in the strength of their will and power to command, but from their imbecility and self-imposed pecuniary embarrassments created by the reproductive impulses of human nature. Their bank accounts superimposed pessimism upon routed imbecility. Instead of changing their own internal power they tried to change the unfavourable environment with which they were threatened. They tried to menace the imperial government forgetful of the latter's moral obligations, which, to their honour be it said, had impelled them to fulfil a promise instead of ignobly wriggling out of it. The recalcitrant civil servants showed by their conduct that they had lost not only their will and power to command, but their will to obey. Discipline, the pivotal principle of social progress, showed regrettable relaxation. They carried on for sometime a morbid propaganda at home with the object of convincing the people that the generosity shown to India by the Government of India Bill, was opposed to the principles of Western civilization, which condemned self-disregarding virtues as the footstool on which other-regarding virtues stood erect, which regarded altruism as a mere waste product of egoism. This bad propaganda, worse manipulated, led to unforeseen evils; and the result of the competitive examinations showed from year to year that the degeneration of the will and power to command was getting diffused over the flower

of the youth of the British Isles to an alarming extent. The British Government conceived the plan of reinvigorating the will and power to command by the love of money (*i.e.*, of personal gain) which characterised Western civilization. They have largely increased the emoluments of civil servants and are paying for propaganda work in the universities to play off their love-of-gain against their relaxing love-of-power. The success of this propaganda work will furnish supplementary evidence of the depth to which the national psychology of Britain has sunk in the sloughy swamp of loathsome lucre. If that propaganda fails British Statesmen may have the satisfaction to know that though the will and power to command may have slackened in British youths they have not been corrupted by the lure of lucre, and that the national future is not very gloomy yet. The spirit of adventure which has characterised the British youth from the day that the ships of the East India Company set sail on their first voyages in the early years of the seventeenth century, undaunted by repeated disasters, caused by stormy seas, malarial climate and Portuguese hostility, was in essence inspired by the will to command, and the dreadfully tragic adventures were the school where the will and power to command were reared, nursed and cherished. The love of lucre was comparatively weak and remote. The loss of that spirit of adventure has an inwardness which has escaped accurate observation, and is in need of a deeper and more intelligent attention than has been so far bestowed on it

India in the nineteenth century was more amenable to bureaucratic command than the German sea which refused to respond to the command of Canute, the Great. Times have changed a little, and the Government of India Act, unaware of the *zeit-geist*, tried to throw some half-real, half-unreal difficulties in the way of the smooth sailing enjoyed by the bureaucracy as if to test their power to command and to morally strengthen it. The Muddiman inquiry shows that though many of the civil servants have showed themselves equal to the task others have failed, and that the future is unfavourable to all of them. The Government of India Act stands in need of change. Change in one direction may wholly upset the civil service and expose their increasing incapacity to command, while change in another direction may rouse Non-Co-operation to a higher pitch of volitional and intellectual energy and lead to a most disagreeable collapse of the administrative machinery. The position

has become difficult for the responsible law-givers. A wrong step either way may end in tragedy. The power to command is not mere muscular power but a complex psychological faculty requiring ingenious handling. This power has to be renewed and recultivated by grappling with difficulties not by avoiding them. What is called tact may be useful in a transient way but the real remedy lies in a change of heart a radical change of psychology from the mean to the noble, from smallness to real greatness of character, from the crookedness of camouflage to straight-forward sincerity.

The British Empire of India is built upon a colossal hoax of providence or Mahamaya to whom centuries are but hours, stability is invisible change towards destruction, volumes are points, weights are atoms, and the world itself is a speck of dust. Pride and shame are the weapons with which she equips human beings as with swords and boomerangs, and laughs when they change hands with congratulations and condolences swarming in the air like flights of locusts. To her, history is a fairy tale, and science but fragments of pebbles on the beach of the ocean of knowledge subject to emergence and submergence caused by lunar influence. On her lips, human criticism of life and of the movements of society creates an evanescent smile. To her, theories of transmigration and biological evolution are childish knocks at the closed gates of fate, and the rise and fall, the progress and decline of empires and civilizations are events that majestically march in disciplined disorder, without consulting human wishes, aspirations and hopes, in the midst of discordant symphonies sung by infernal cherubims in the nebulous domes of celestial pandemonium. The light that she creates is but visible darkness which tantalizes the eye, and never quenches its thirst for vision. Her breath makes and unmakes at pleasure universal laws and postulates, gives to decadence the brightness of progress, and to victories and triumphs the reality of melancholy defeats. At her command the past sinks out of sight, and the present rashly rushes into the future, and is presently drowned in the abyss of eternity, to emerge no more.

The will to command and the power to command reside in the group, as well as in the individual, personality. In the middle ages the personality of the Church was the most important group-personality in Europe. It had the will to command and it acquired

the power to command chiefly by the power of the will to command. Both the will and the power in this revered personality has now declined almost to the zero point. The history of Europe from the eleventh century onward until the advent of the modern age is the history of the will and the power of the Church to command. The crusades, the inquisitions, the bulls and edicts, the Church taxes, the persecution of heresy and of science are the events which gave expression to the Church-personality's will and power to command. At present the personality of labour having shaken off its unconditional will to obey, seems to be the most prominent group-personality in the civilized world. In India the will to command was reserved for the caste-personality of the Brahmin supported by that of the Kshattriya. Here also by the pressure of circumstances both these personalities are climbing down the ladder of command.

The great war brought to the fore-front a number of individual-personalities whose names will remain in history to the end of the present civilization. Among these Kaiser Wilhelm II, and Hindenburg, Foch and Clemenceau, Lord Kitchner and Lloyd Geroge, Lenin and Trotzky with President Wilson were the most prominent. In the Kaiser and in the President the will to command appears to have been disproportionate to the power of command. This disproportion caused their failure and defeat. Lord Kitchner did not survive long enough to show how he bore the proportion between the will and the power to command. The subordination of the British army to the French command took definite shape after his death, and it is difficult to say what course British and French consultation would have taken in regard to the command, had Lord Kitchner been alive at the time. The worst part of the business lies in the fact that the arrangement did not merely imply the superiority of General Foch over General Haig, but penetrated the domain of the national personalities concerned. It exposed to the view of the world the difference between the will and power to command as possessed by France and England. England has shared the tangible fruits of the victory, but her moral loss has been immense. It is difficult to say whether she has gained or lost more by the transaction. At the present moment the bare fact that the arrangement led to the defeat of the central powers clouds public opinion. The subsequent course of history shows that France has gained an advantage over England which will develop steadily

with the lapse of time. The world is already feeling that the will and the power to command is the strongest in France among all the national personalities. Most people now believe that Clemenceau held the destiny of Europe and of the world in his hands while President Wilson merely presided as a figure head in the Hall of Mirrors. Clemenceau and Wilson are now all but forgotten. But the prestige of the French nation still regulates all international relations, and promises to regulate them with increasing will and power to command in the future as far as that can be seen. To lose prestige it to lose the will to command. The weakness of the will to command led to the surrender of her prestige by the British Cabinet. The loss of prestige is a real loss to a nation and not a mere psychological abstraction

I have indicated how America, having fallen under the spell of Western civilization with its poisoned nectar of constructive destruction, became metamorphosed, in the course of three short centuries, in colour and character, ethnical and moral, and climbed by cosmic leaps and bounds from the hunting base of the cone of civilization to its apex of science and industrialism, passing with the speed of lightning through the several stages of progress on which anthropologists and historians delight to dwell with amplifications and illuminating illustrations. Washington Irving was so struck by an infinitesimal fragment of this progress that he found it instructive as well as interesting for mankind to create out of his fertile imagination a character, whom he baptised with the name of Rip Van Winkle, and who after enjoying a short siesta of eighteen years in the jungle awoke to find America transfigured from the monotonous tranquility of village life to the tumult of democratic hurry and bustle. It seems unintelligible to me why Irving instead of contenting himself with this fragment did not think of writing a similar, but much grander and more marvellous, story of the whole metamorphosis effected by western civilization in three hundred years which neither the cosmic process of natural selection nor the ordinary ethical process of Huxley could have achieved in less than thirty thousand years. Perhaps Mr. Irving's accidental imagination was not vigorous enough to conjure up a trance of three hunderd years. Perhaps like Professor Sidgwick's, his historical will (the will to recall the shameful and defeated past) recoiled from the task of dilating on the details of ferocity and treachery by which his

venerable national forbears had accumulated the legacy which he was complacently enjoying with his neighbours. Sidgwick loathed these details with the loathing of a true Christian when he remarked that these details formed a "painful chapter in history," and that the sooner they were forgotten the better. Civilization, all over the world, is a delightful legacy bequeathed by brutish savagery and criminality. It is vested right built upon time-barred and lapsed natural right. But who ever before heard of not merely natural rights but the claimants themselves wiped out in so short a time as three centuries? The blood of the Czardom of Russia has been recently wiped out. But a family is a mere speck in the firmament of a nation. Absolutely and relatively speaking the civilization of America is the most wonderful historical phenomenon as yet known to man—as wonderful in its power of destruction as for its capacity for construction. Nature has destroyed old races, and created new ones in their place, by what is now known as natural selection or natural rejection, but compare her progress with that of Western civilization in America.

Buddhism spread over half of Asia in a thousand years. Christanity spread over the small continent of Europe in a similar period. Islam spread over half of Asia and Africa with a part of Europe in a few hundred years Can the rapidity of expansion and the depth of intensification of these spiritual forces compare with the expansion and intensification of Western civilization? The latter has expanded over the entire globe in the course of three short centuries It has also sunk into the hearts of the people among whom it has spread more deeply than did the principles of those religions. The ethical commandments of Western civilization are more easily learnt and more cheerfully respected and obeyed than those of the latter. They are fragments of naturalism filled into the pragmatic steel frame of that civilization. Self love and hate for neighbour have been systematised and organized into a science. These fragments of naturalism are non-purposive and non-moral at home. They have become civilized into purposive, moral principles of conduct in their new setting. That is the distinction between pragmatism and naturalism. Naturalism knows no virtue or vice, reward or punishment, pleasure or pain. It works unconsciously, steadily, immutably. Pragmatism foresees consequence and looks for reward or punishment. Its reward is personal or

national or racial, but mainly personal. Western civilization does the same with perhaps greater intellectuality, longer and wider vision, and higher outlook. It appraises conduct on the payment by result system. Judged by this test western civilization has been stupendously successful. Judged by more ancient tests it has been monstrously self-expressive. Human foresight—How far can it go? Who can say what lies beyond its limited perspective—behind the everlasting screen? Indian philosophy rejects everything which is not permanent as unreal. It has rejected the material world, and all the happiness that it bestows. It seeks permanent happiness. Western civilization clamours for happiness intelligible to the ordinary mind. Its idealism does not transcend the limits of practicability. It is lower in conception, and therefore more easily realizable.

THE REGULATIVE PRINCIPLE IN SOCIAL ORGANISATION.

It is more than probable that in the beginning of the organization of society all men had the will to command, and none, the will to obey, and that those who eventually established the regulative system of command and obedience experienced great difficulty in converting the will-to-command to the will-to-obey in their neighbours, while they themselves enormously developed the same. Perhaps ages passed in the process of conversion, and great disorder and blood-shed characterised it. It is marvellous that a small minority had to conquer a large majority. It is probable that the minority was not so small in the beginning nor the majority so large as now. It is even probable that the two sides were represented by equal numbers. But there is no theory which supports the idea that the majority commanded while the minority obeyed at any period of the process. The general tendency of progress is towards a diminution in the number of those who command and an increase in the number of those who obey. This tendency shows accelerative force down to this day, though in recent times great effort has been made to arrest it. The will-to-command still shows a tendency towards concentration, while the will-to-obey is expanding in volume.

The devolping pressure of population in the early ages imposed upon the natural insularity of man the unexpected burden of catastrophic gregarianism, and its concomitant chaos. To reduce this

chaos to order was a problem of great difficulty, when everybody was willing to command and none willing to obey, for social order means, primarily, the division of society into two parts, the one commanding and the other obeying. We may form some idea of the magnitude of the difficulties of our venerable forbears when we consider the imbecility of the rulers of men in the present age to keep law and order when the density of population increases even by one per cent. At the present moment in India the Government finds great difficulty in keeping order, that is, in enforcing obedience among those who are required by the social order to obey. Ordinary crime is increasing and revolutionary crime is also showing its head now and again. Revolutionary disorder means nothing but that the proportion between the commanding minority and the obeying majority has been disturbed. How has this proportion been disturbed? Some say it has been disturbed by the diffusion of education. Some say it has been disturbed by over-population and increasing opportunities for the play of gregarianism. There are others who maintain that the total quantity of subsistence is either decreasing, or is not increasing in the same ratio as population. There are others still who hold that the disorder is due to unjust distribution of the annually recurring wealth of the country. There are in the last place men who hold that foreign exploitation, manifesting itself in various crooked ways, is taking away an increasing quantity of this recurring wealth. Probably all the causes are at work, though the rulers sometimes pretend to think that the whole phenomenon of disorder is due to sheer cussedness, specially energising itself in a few selected devil's workshops. They run after this imaginary devil, and find the disorder increasing. I would advise them to chase the 'Dismal Devil' who has a real extence, instead of wasting their energy upon the pursuit of this phantom of a devil.

Our ancient fore-fathers possessed no science, economic or political, no steam engine or control over electricity, no gun powder or dynamite, no gun or pistol, not even a sword or a sharp cutting knife or boomerang to help them to bring order out of disorder. They had to deal not with interrupted order, but with primeval disorder, the disorder created not by God but by the Dismal Devil. They had no experience to help them. Besides they had as yet no settled habit of lying or of concealing the truth, no art of deception, no rattrap or fish-bait, no hypocrisy or diplomacy, and only a little

cunning to help them in the arduous task. They depended in the first place upon bare arms, upon the power of muscles opportunely used. They developed these arts after entering upon their work. No wonder they took an unconscionably long time to create order out of disorder. No wonder they shed much blood in the process. They did not even know what order meant or how it could be achieved. They only felt a sort of restlessness in their heart, and an unspeakable disgust of the existing state, and a vague craving for a better state. They wanted peace as the end of their efforts, and resorted to war as the means of attaining it. War never ceased, either in actu or in posse, but some sort of peace evolved out it. They wanted complete peace, but that never came. It has not come as yet. Nay, in the twentieth century it has definitely taken a contrary course, and war in the heart is more rampant than peace out of it—war not merely between nations, but between social groups and between individuals. Man seems to be visibly approaching towards the ancient war of one against all—the state of things which our ancient grand-sires created in their desire for peace. I say they created it, because their grandparents lived in the peace of isolation, not yet impinged upon by overpopulation, not yet suffering from the glare of the 'Dismal Devil.' The Dismal Devil increased the density of population beyond the point at which each person could live by himself or herself. He brought men into mutual contact, and left them to decide for themselves whether they should live in war or in peace. Each of them decided that they should live in friendship and peace by mutual help if necessary. But in what way was one person to help another, when both had the instinct and will to command, and not the instinct or will to obey. How was one person to approach another for help? —by supplication or by command? Each commanded his neighbours and was met by resentment from them. Each of them suffered from what may be called megalomania. The melee that ensued lasted for ages, and at length ended in partial peace by the many learning to obey the few. Those whose love of life exceeded their love of liberty adopted the will to obey when temporarily disabled in the fight. The victor took advantage of this defeat, and showed him kindness in exchange for submissiveness. Temporary weakness led to permanent weakness. The victor commanded and the vanquished obeyed. Thus the will to obey became increasingly diffused till a small minority began to command a large majority.

The inequality of position and of liberty gradually deepened till those who obeyed became slaves, and those who commanded became masters. The association of masters organised Government for their own benefit, made laws for the same purpose and increasingly made it difficult for the obeying majority to revolt against the order thus established. The root of disorder, though scotched, was not destroyed, however.

The inequality of social position did not directly lead to inequality of wealth or gratification for the cravings. These cravings consisted in the beginning of the desire for food and for satisfaction of the sex-instinct. The complications introduced by the aesthetic cravings had not yet arisen, and there was as yet no distinction between fine food and coarse food. Perhaps aesthetic cravings first showed themselves in the gratification of the sexinstinct, and a kind of primitive eugenics, based more upon good health than upon beauty, gradually brought about differentiations, pleasing or painful to the senses, chiefly to the sense of vision. In the same way as food increased in variety and differentiated in taste inequality of wealth began to develop itself.

In course of time this inequality of wealth deepened the love of wealth, which gradually weakened the love of power, and the will to command, leading to industrialism and its evils. Western civilization has the unique merit of developing in parallel lines the love of wealth and the love of power. But so great is the charm of wealth that with further progress, the love of wealth leaves the love of power behind, and introduces a new epoch, injurious to society.

The will to command involved greater risks than the will to obey. At the same time it had a greater fascination. It is difficult to say whether men have lost more by the undue development of the will to command than by that of the will to obey, or what amounts to the same thing in an indirect way, whether the will to command has cost mankind, physically and morally, more than the will to obey. It seems certain that different parts of humanity in different parts of the world have paid different prices for obtaining the advantages of the bifurcation and subsequent development of the two wills. This price, it seems to me, was the highest in the Western countries where now exists that type of social discipline which represents the moral aspect of Western civilization. It follows that

while greater difficulty and delay has been experienced in reducing the stubborn masses to obedience, the actual result in the long run in the shape of social co-operation has been more satisfactory. The masses in the West have a higher discipline and a greater reverence for those in command than in the East, where the initial obedience was more easily secured. The life of command has had a comparatively easy time of it in the East, and when the West came in aggressive contact with the East, the latter accepted the position of obedience more readily than her sister had anticipated. More than half the population of the world living in the East have submitted themselves to the position of obedience to be exploited by the commanding West. The West is recovering with compound interest the high cost of securing the harmonious development of the two 'Wills' at home. In her contact with India, particularly, the will to command has found the easiest scope over an immense area and population. The machinery of command and obedience, until lately, worked so smoothly that no lubrication was thought necessary. But an unlubricated machine has the defect of getting slack by continued friction—a defect which subsequent lubrication can seldom remedy. That is the melancholy position in which the administration of India finds itself to-day after a smooth working for a hundred and fifty years.

That in the West the initial prehistoric struggle for social order was of a strenuous character will be evident from the way in which the occasional upheavals of the spirit of disobedience and revolt against the orthodox order, were dealt with in the middle ages long after that order had passed its incipient stage. It will appear from the ruthless, reckless, remorseless manner in which Wycliff-ism, Hussitism, heresy and dissent, and the emergence of science out of the darkness of catholicism were met by those who held the position of command in that order. The cost of maintaining or restoring order in those penumbric centuries has been subsequently more than recouped by the West in her dealings with the East. Initial difficulties lead to subsequent facilities. The power to command on the one hand and the will to obey on the other have developed to an enormous extent in the social discipline of the West, with the result that both artificial co-operation and natural competition have higher vitality there than in the East. Here lies the secret how Eastern civilization having developed much earlier than her Western sister has long been showing signs of senility,

while the latter is in full prime enjoying the sweets of civilization inspite of effervescing chances of violent death by the effects of excessive blood pressure and elevated nerves. Her contact with her old sister (still mainly jubilant over the memories of her past beauty and glory), who now, like an old widow, complacently cooks her food, makes her tea, washes and irons her clothes and prepares her toilette, is slowly instilling into her youthfully majestic heart softness, touchiness, haggishness, priggishness, pusillanimity and diabolical suspicion, that is, old womanishness, in short, has given her an ephemeral effulgence, foreboding evil in the not very remote future. It is marvellous that in spite of the melancholy experiences of oriental civilizations men of culture living in parasitic comfort, ease and repose, both in the East and the West, regard the slowly diminishing ruthlessness and brutishness of Western civilization as an indication of advance towards a higher plane in which humanity will realize the brotherhood of man. The truth seems to lie in the direction of the conclusion that Western civilization, unless she dies a sudden and premature death in thunder, earth-quake or volcanic eruption, has the same prospects before her that her Eastern sister is now experiencing. She will drag a lengthening longevity, lived upon the memory of the glories of the past, blind and feeble, unable to walk without a stick, bearing the burden of life for the bare satisfaction that she is not dead, though storm and thunder have passed over her dilapidated existence many times and over centuries, and proudly admonishing mankind to be prepared for ancestor worship, the true panacea for social degeneration, and teaching that in the order of human progress the golden age precedes the age of iron, and that, in the order of art, wrought iron is obtained from steel, cast iron, from wrought iron, and pig iron from cast iron, and that rust does not destroy but protect, by covering the true metal within. Western civilization may evade this catastrophic orientation, but, unless she makes up her mind to maintain, and if possible, to invigorate her accustomed remorselessness in maintaining due proportion and order in regard to the will to command and the will to obey in her domestic concerns, she may ascend or descend, but she will lose her distinctive character.

It will not be irrelevant to remark here that the world's civilization will not die with Western civilization, whether the latter expires by sudden violence or by foreign poison injected by contact with Eastern civilization, by external vandalism or by internal

barbarism, for inspite of all exploitive cruelties in the past, exhibited in wholesale extirpations or enslavements, fresh blood still exists in the world, in Central Asia, for instance, for fresh development of civilization in the future, however long the umbral interregnum may last. I say this because no people in the world have so far enjoyed civilization twice over. I am sometimes tempted to say that no people suffer more than once in their lives from civilization, which, if it comes a second time, never shows the vigour and virulence of the first attack. The inoculation of civilization registers itself in the nervous system in the shape of an amalgamated mass of multifarious poisonous ideas, which by their incompatibility and mutual antagonism bring on intellectual insanity and muscular paralysis of an incurable type. Even where recovery is possible rejuvenation never follows convalescence. The old civilized brain is a dilapidated house, aesthetically furnished but over-run by rats and lizards, flies and mosquitoes, white ants and red ants, living upon decomposing sloughs of festering rationalism running in channels of multitudinous directions. It is a ramshackle structure, whose erect tallness gives a deceptive idea of the strength of the cement that keeps it standing still. A civilization whose ethics are founded upon sightless faith and shortsighted rationalism characterised by a mixture of naturalism and supernaturalism, of humanism and idealism, of absolutism and relativism, of Buddhism and Darwinism, of loving Christianity and crusading catholicism, of forgiveness and retaliatory vindictiveness, of world-affirmation and world-negation, of pessimism and optimism, of defensive war and peaceful penetration, of truthfulness and concealment of facts, of sincerity and diplomacy, of alliances and balances, of free-trade and heavy revenue-tariffs, of imperial preference and fair trade, of the principles of the league of nations and international suspicions, of capitalism and communism, of female emancipation and wedded subordination, is doomed. The orient and the occident can never be good friends. Their embrace is bad for both, directly for the first and remotely for the second.

SOME FOUNDATIONAL FACTS OF THE ETHICS OF WESTERN CIVILIZATION.

To return to the question of self-love and hate for neighbour. In the first place distinction must be made between the higher-self and the lower-self. The higher-self in man is God. Uddalaka Aruni said, "Thou art that". Krishna said, "I am he". Christ said "I and my father are one". The Book of Genesis says, "God made man in his own image." It was the devil that gave him a drastic orientation. The same book also says that man was made out of the dust. The dust-self is the lower-self, and the image of God the higher-self. Love of the higher-self is the love of the *Paramatma* residing in the *Jivatma*, and is tantamount to the love of God. No adverse criticism of this self-love is admissible in a society which has a religion, which believes in a God as the support of the world of life. I shall speak of love for the self of practical life, that is of self-love as understood by the common people. This love is universal. The higher-self may have a distinct life or merely a life which represents a sublimated continuation of the lower-self or practical life. It is the love of self that gives value to life. All other love is made in imitation of this supreme love. When the Gospel says, "Love thy neighbour as thyself," it recognizes the supreme nature of self-love. Love for others should try to imitate it—be a true copy of it, if possible—in character and intensity. Self-love is thus the ideal love. It is supreme also because it is instinctive, the only other instinctive love being the love of the mother for the child. All other love is reasoned, and therefore rickety.

Is self-love equally strong in all men, in all climes, in all civilizations? If it is not, how does the difference arise? In the first place instincts are not equally strong all over the world, and love as an instinct varies in vigour with environment, with latitude and longitude, flora and fauna, soil and climate. Love touched by reason varies with social conditions, education, and the general moral atmosphere, comprising customs and traditions. Instinctive self-love and reasoned self-love have coalesced in the West, and have gathered strength with age. Self-love means love of life—where love of life is strong self-love must be strong also. The love of life is stronger in the West than in the East. Self-love follows this difference like a corollary. Self-love varies with the intensity

of the struggle for existence. This struggle is more strenuous in the West than in the East. It has been so from the beginning and is gradually increasing in intensity. Benjamin Kidd tells us that the struggle for existence is kept in Western society at high water mark deliberately to facilitate social progress. Of course the idea lurks in his mind that it is so kept up among the working majority for the benefit of the parasitic minority, who constitute real society—the brain of it as contrasted with the brawn. Among social philosophers, though his conclusions may be unacceptable, Benjamin Kidd holds a high place for chivalrous regard for truth. Life is maintained in the West in a sea of perilous precariousness. The love of life increases in intensity with the difficulty of maintaining it, and the uncertainties which accompany it. With the love of life self-love develops, and with self-love develops the love of life as a whole, by the magic touch of reason which prompts man to keep his neighbours alive so that he may the better evade the Curse of Adam. Love of neighbour, so far it exists, is a necessary condition of successful self-love, and is cherished as such.

Hate for neighbour is instinctive. Love for neighbour is a reasoned impulse. Hate for neighbour varies as love for self, so far as it is instinctive. Reasoned love or hate for neighbour stands upon a different ground. Instinctive hate is in direct opposition to instinctive love. But reasoned hate is not thus related to reasoned love. They are confused. And it is difficult to infer from any particular conduct whether it is prompted by hate or love, or whether neither of the sentiments has any play in the heart. Indeed conduct is gradually divorcing itself from the heart. Collective beneficence may have no connection with the condition of the heart of the donor, or may be prompted by self-love manifesting itself as a creative force which brings social honour and governmental patronage, or may be motivated by high spiritual altruism or actuated by both the sentiments. But in no case can a clear association be established between the quantity of beneficence and the strength of the spirit of motive force, egoistic or altruistic or both. A rich man gives a donation of fifty thousand rupees for a charitable institution. He may do so out of sheer indifference, having more money than he can dispose of, or out of love or charity for the poor and helpless, or out of a desire for a new-year or birth-day title, or for a higher title, if he is already in possession of one.

When British capitalists invest money in the jute trade, they benefit the cultivators of Bengal. How is this beneficence to be accounted for? It is probable that in thus investing their money they are either unaware of the existence of the cultivators or don't think of their good and evil at all. The investment is made for profit and for profit alone. The benefit of the cultivator arises as a waste product of the investment. The directors and managing agents do their best to minimise this waste product, and the investors express their gratitude to them at the annual general meeting at which dividend is declared. I have never heard of any resolution passed or even proposed at such a meeting condemning the directors for increasing the dividend at the expense of the cultivators. On the contrary no stone is left unturned to deceive them and thereby inducing them to increase the acreage of cultivation. Indeed all the moral evils of monopoly are associated with the jute trade, whose course of procedure reminds one of the wisdom of the Greeks who had one God, (Hermes) presiding over both trade and theft. One marvels at the impudence of Scottish merchants who profess to carry on the trade in the interests of the cultivators of Bengal. Theft, by its subtlety, is becoming the "national profession" of the civilized races. If the Greeks had the experience and wisdom of the present age they might have brought all the precious principles of love, suggested, if not directly prompted, by the Dismal Science, as well as all the moralities mentioned in Chapter XVII of the Indian Penal Code under the administrative suzerainty of a single God. Western civilization has the unique reputation of evolving virtues out of vices, magnificence out of meanness, splendour out of darkness, love out of hate, reverence out of contempt, truth out of lie, and a God for worship out of the eternal asphyxiating abyss.

Lancashire, it is reported, is now engaged in making experiments for the production of cheap and durable cloths out of Indian cotton to bring economic relief to the poor peasants of this continent, after vainly trying to increase the cotton excise duty with the object of relieving the Indian market of the coarse cloths, unworthy of civilized life, manufactured in Indian mills. The power to manufacture love out of hate, and truth out of lie, marks the moral progress of Western civilization more conspicuously than the power to manufacture good cloth out of bad cotton, or fine cutlery out of pig iron. The corrupting influence of Western civilization upon human morals is more potent than its refining influence upon human manners.

Morals and manners have now been almost completely divided and packed as luggage in separate trunks for convenience in the voyage of life. Whether we look at external objects or into the inward nature of man, we find intellectuality regulating the affairs of the world without consulting the higher moral nature of man. Herbert Spencer in his old age, after a vigorous intellectual life passed mainly in showing that morality was, after all, in its origin and development, an intellectual process consisting in an analysis of the consequences of conduct, changed his horizon of vision and regretted the growing "identification of mind with intelligence." "The emotions," said he, "are the masters, the intellect is the servant." (Page 27, *Facts and Comments*). He would have been more accurate if he had laid due emphasis on the lower emotions as the true masters in Western civilization. The identification of mind with intelligence in the eye of the average man of the West is due to the growing feebleness of the higher emotions, and the natural unwillingness of man to admit the growing strength of the lower emotions. The higher emotions are suffering from drought and emaciation, while the lower emotions are masterfully controlling the intellect, which, ashamed of admitting its subordination to such ignoble masters pretends to convince the world that it has dethroned all the emotions, high and low, and is ruling the world by its own authority as the dictator of the microcosm. Jealousy, hate and suspicion are the principal emotions in the Western heart. Egoism, individual, national and communal, is the suzerain power that guides all other emotions and enjoys the fruits of their activities, almost unseen. National and communal egoism masquerades as altruism, as if group-life represented nothing but the aggregate of the lives of the individuals composing it, and were not an organism by itself, which though living in abstract thought has a powerful emotional and volitional individuality. The nationalist, in the blazing uniform of the patriot, thinks that all that he does, he does out of love for his co-citizens, who are his true neighbours in the vocabulary of the decalogue. He thinks in short that by competing with foreigners in commerce or in fighting them at the front he demonstrates that he is a true Christian who loves his neighbours as himself. Even the rank blatant communalist who fights for the interests of his caste to the detriment of national causes thinks or pretends to think in the same fashion. Both the nationalist and the communalist by habitually practising intellectual dissimulation come

at length to deceive themselves and to believe in their hearts that they are real altruists, and when they pay subscriptions to the common funds of the organized group in the shape of taxes or levies, or shed their blood as soldiers in the field of Flanders, they think, or persuade themselves, that they are making self-sacrifice out of the depths of their altruistic hearts in which self and neighbour find no discrimination. Even conscript soldiers forced into the field inspite of conscientious objections or unpatriotic repugnance to war receive honours, nationally and more rationally reserved for youthful volunteers, who on reading a newspaper one morning cast away their books, and rushed to the war office for enrolment, and never again got the opportunity of greeting their mothers at home. The altruistic self-sacrifice of the conscript soldier publicly honoured by his countrymen is a marvellous illustration of blasphemously travestied reverence for the tenth commandment of which every human being with an unbefogged self-consciousness has reason to be ashamed. The ethics of Western civilization, corrupted by the selfishness of the national self and the communal-self, has, with greater cleverness than any other civilization, ancient or modern, ennobled and adorned barbaric and brutish egoism with costumes and titles stolen from the wardrobe and heraldic archives of altruism. Natural illusions are invigorated by artificial ones to make this civilization shine with dazzling, blinding splendour.

What were the emotions that ruled the heart of the British lad who withdrew from the college and enrolled himself in the barrack at Lord Kitchener's command? Nobody can believe that the intellect by itself furnished the impulse that goaded him out of his customary surroundings. Were the emotions all of the higher order or of the lower or belonged to a mixed group? We want a correct psycho-analysis of the lad's heart at the moment he formed the determination to rush into the recruiting sergeant's arms. The intellect, I am inclined to think, was paralysed, and not, as Herbert Spencer thinks, merely enslaved. The thought-element of his mind was overwhelmed. He did not himself know what emotions actually worked in his mind at the moment. His books, particularly the poems, epic and lyric alike, his neighbour in the press, pulpit and platform, had told him that patriotism was the noblest of virtues, and that patriotism invited him to run to the front. It was the imitative emotion, reinforcing the hate for neighbour, that caused him to forget his mother and little sisters, his love of Christ and

reverence for his teachings, his duty towards himself, his God and his neighbour, and to run madly for the purpose of violating the sixth commandment on as large a scale as possible. Does this emotion belong to the higher order or the lower? The emotion has all the characteristics of an instinct, and is almost wholly untouched by reason. Once enrolled the suddenly maddened enthusiast had no alternative but to get drilled for murdering neighbours and to learn the tricks of self-preservation in the dust and smoke of battle. Even here, he had lost his individuality, his freedom of will, his soul. He had turned himself into a machine. To think or to act for himself was vicious—an offence liable to courtmartial.

All civilizations have brought up soldiers, made wars and openly shewn their disrespect for the second commandment. The distinctive trait of Western civilization lies in the fact that it has made a science of the whole buisness, and has, as by magic, obliterated the distinction between disrespect and reverence, between love and hate, between truth and lie, and now threatens to destroy the distinction between high and low, between good and evil, between noble and mean, between humanity and brutality, between altruism and egoism, between selfishness and self-sacrifice. I have spoken of self-love as the pivot round which the Ethics of Western civilization gyrates and makes conduct fruitful. In practical life all over the world self-love plays an important part. Love for others increases with advance towards the ideal life. The ideal life of the West would have been almost identical with the ideal life of the East if the influence of Christianity were as great as it is sometimes supposed to be, and if Christianity instead of declining with the centuries had maintained a steady growth. But as already indicated Christianity was never more than a veneer on the primitive character of the Western people, and has for several centuries been definitely losing the substance by the onslaught of Greek Humanism, modern naturalism and Jacobin pragmatism, so that the ideal life of Christianity, far from being approximated to in practice, is being increasingly discarded in theory, and as practice follows theory, like illustration following definition, the future of Christianity is becoming hopelessly melancholy. Lord Balfour in the nineteenth century regretted that self love did not show ideal vigour in the west in that century and was suffering from an undesirable relaxation. (*Foundations of Belief*). He held this opinion in commenting on the ethics of naturalism. But his study of the current of ethical tendencies

seems to have been lamentably erroneous. That current has been developing during the last half a century with astounding results. The great war is one of these results. Diabolical suspicion which keeps Europe in constant dread of war and anarchy is the psyhcological offspring of intensive self-love, the pivotal principle of the ethics of western civilization.

Self-love is invertibrate and jejune without the support of hate for neighbour, which constitutes its brain, brawn, bone and blood, in this world of limited wealth and unlimited cravings, ruled by the fascinating tyranny of the Dismal Devil. Personal self-love purged of hate for neighbour is as preposterous as patriotism without international pugnacity, or religious fanaticism without contempt for other creeds, or communal enthusiasm without gloomy oblique glances at rival communities. The national-self, the communal-self and the credal-self are all created in the image of the personal-self. International jealousies, communal conflicts and credal rivalries are imitations in an expanded form of personal hatred for neighbour. Hate for neighbour may be aggressive or passive, explicit or implicit, and may lead either to competition or to co-operation, or to both in succession. Fight with a neighbour may lead to enslavement of the latter with the happy result of co-operation, the foundation of civilization. Co-operation is always traceable to competition and conflict ; and competition and conflict are traceable to hate for neighbour. The foundation of civilization thus lies in "Hate for neighbour". This Hate for neighbour is both creative and destructive in regard to civilization. In the early stages it is creative, and in the advanced age of civilization it is destructive. As we all live in the latter age we forget the primordial creative influence of Hate. Western civilization has the unique trait of being supported as well as created by Hate. Co-operation conceived in pure love, that is, love completely dissociated from hate is a rare commodity limited to sexual and domestic relations, and generally ephemeral in duration. Love ceases to be pure love when co-operation is anticipated. It is thenceforward maintained by self-love, which, as already said, is barren and imbecile without the backing of hate, not necessarily directed to the co-operative correlate, but flowing in some channel or other. Sexual co-operation while it is increasing in ardour is decreasing in duration as evidenced by the increasing number of divorces in the civilized west, where the institution of marriage, the highest and purest expression of

sexual love, is getting increasingly disparaged, and is losing its social value by its growing barrenness as a race-preserving force. Indeed Western genius, eager to evade the dreadful glare of the Dismal Devil, is now engaged in inventing constructive weapons for the destruction of society—weapons designed to facilitate and keep alive sexual love divested of the danger of unmanageable domestic over-population.

I have said western civilization is sustained by hate. Hate in its turn is not only sustained but developed by Western civilization. Western civilization and hate by their mutual helpfulness and co-operation have rendered it possible for the Western people to obtain ascendancy over the entire globe. The oceanic discoveries of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries were prompted by Hate, the mother of exploitation. Columbus was not inspired by the desire of showing his friendship and love for the subjects of Kublai Khan by direct salutation and friendly embrace. His object was to add to the wealth of Europe, and of Spain in particular, by exploiting the people and their natural resources.

His successors, who completed his work, were unblushing exploiters and haters of the heathen world. It is wonderful to contemplate the expansive and developmental impetus which Hate received by the glorious geographical discoveries of the childhood of Western civilization. This is how Hate has expanded :—John hated James. Essex hated Wessex. England hated Scotland. Britain hated France. Every country in Europe hated all other countries of that continent. Columbus showed the way, and Europe now hates all other continents of the world. Some of these continents she has made her own, and she would have loved them as herself if the by-products of her loving embrace did not develop dreadful poisons which now threatens to destroy Western civilization root and branch. External barbarians have been extirpated or bound in fetters, but internal barbarism glares with a dreadful flare. The Dismal Devil seems determined to relieve the white man of his self-imposed burden—the burden of Western civilization.

I shall conclude this section by drawing attention to what appears to be a paradox in the ethics of Western civilization. While this civilization is characterised by great love of life it has very little reverence for life, destroying life (1) when it is convinced that the purpose for which life exists remains unfulfilled and (2) when it

perceives that that purpose has no chance of being fulfilled. Life is risked when the fulfilment of its purpose becomes precarious. The purpose of life is to live in happiness, that is, in comforts added to personal freedom. It recognizes the truth of the proposition that the will-to-live is universal ; but it refuses to recognize the equality as well as the universality of the right to live. As a rule the right to live is, in its eye, proportioned to the might to live. There is only one exception to their rule of right. The first person has the best right to live irrespective of his might, unless he is himself convinced that he has lost that right. In other words, it is the honest conviction of every civilized man that the world lives for him. This idea is probably derived from Hebrew wisdom, which says in the Book of Genesis, that God made the beasts and birds and fishes, and gave to man dominion over them. The new idea of Western civilization is an extension of this old idea. It gives to every man the right to think that the entire world of inanimate and animate objects, including human beings, has for its primary purpose the duty of doing its best to contribute to his happiness, and that if it fails to do it, it loses its right to existence in proportion to its failure, and places itself at his disposal for punishment, whose character and amount are conditioned by his power of inflicting it. This power may be absolutely his own, or it may be gathered from the obedience of other individuals willing to help him. This is one of the secrets of the ethics of Western civilization. In plain words, "the world lives for me, and if the world fails to function for this purpose it has forfeited its right to live in my eyes. Whether it will actually continue to live or not depends upon my power to destroy or to coerce it into obedience."

As to love of life accompanied by the lack of reverence for life take the case of domestic animals. They are gram-fed, washed and clothed, and receive veterinary treatment. But they are sold to the highest trader among the butchers of Smith-field market, with the conscience untouched. The diseased horse or dog, the best pet of the master, is shot without the least compunction when there is danger of infection spreading or when the disease is medically pronounced to be incurable. Reason is said to lie at the back of the phenomenon. Captives in war, if they are too numerous to be kept in order, or to be properly fed and accommodated with due regard to economy they, are slaughtered by the dictates of reason. Conscripts are sent to the front along with volunteers with all the

risks of the field of battle. Segregation in plague is a civilized mode of showing irreverence for life. In a life boat in which provisions are running short some lives are destroyed at random for the safety of other lives. The workhouse was invented by Western civilization for the benefit of people living outside it. Recently in France a wife shot her husband with his consent because he was suffering from an incurable disease. The slaughter has been declared to be warranted by the spirit of the law of the land. Other countries are following suit. This irreverence for life lies at the back of most of what is considered glorious in Western civilization. It has extirpated brute life in the forests, and turned them into cities. It has annihilated races of mankind. It has from the beginning enslaved neighbours. It has subjected them to hard work on small ration. It has created and developed exploitation and enabled a few to evade the Curse of Adam at the expense of the many. It has simplified the future ethnography of most of the world, and it now threatens to rebarbarize it.

THE DISMAL DEVIL'S GLARE IN THE DARK—VI.

SLAVERY AND SOCIETY.

THE PROMISCUITY OF EXPLOITATION.

Exploitation has very little respect for colour, creed or blood. It does not discriminate between latitude, longitude or altitude as things by themselves. It is egoistic by its nature and judges conduct solely by utility. It looks to nothing except net profit, that is, the ultimate gain determined by substracting cost from sale-value. Exploitation means, in the ultimate analysis, nothing less than the outward expression of the desire to eat bread in the sweat of neighbour's face. The neighbour may live next door or in the remotest corner of the earth. He may be a Christian or Mussalman, a Polytheist or Animist, a Pantheist or Buddhist ; he may have any colour of the spectrum on his skin. He may live in the tropics, in the temperate zone or in the arctic circle. He may be a Negro, a Chinaman or an Esquimo. Entire humanity is open to the embrace of the exploiter. He has no respect for sex or human

conventions, determining the mutual relations of the sexes. To him Ethnography and spectrography, geography, and physiography, theology and biology, thermology and meteorology are all irrelevant. He wants to eat bread and to avoid irksome work. He wants freedom for himself absolutely and thraldom for the rest of the world relatively. He is a parasite by nature and his code of ethics is the code of the parasite.

PRIMITIVE SLAVERY.

In primitive times slaves had the same blood as the master because the master had no opportunity of enslaving men of a different blood. As population increased men of dissimilar blood approached one another, not in love but out of necessity. They came within striking distance of one another. This enabled exploitation to improve its ethics a little. Slaves of the same blood were not emancipated at once, but the master began to feel a sort of respect for consanguinity. Next as the locomotive contrivances increased in usefulness the exploiter began to distinguish between close and remote neighbour, till the entire world was discovered with all its variations of colour, creed and blood ; and the differential treatment which the exploiter introduced seemed for the time being to point to the conclusion that exploitation would be gradually thinning at the centre and would thicken towards the circumference, thus allowing opportunities for a great advance in morality. Man by nature shows different degrees of kindness and cruelty to different species of animals. Perhaps he is least kind to those species which are remotest from him in blood according to the geneology prepared by the followers of evolution. The moral sentiment is relative. Love becomes rarified by diffusion; hate gets stronger by expansion. This was the principle of morality which men at one time cherished. But recent course of history has undeceived them. The eye of exploitation is fixed upon efficiency, net result, profit, interest and rent.

GREEK SLAVERY AND CIVILIZATION.

Greek civilization advanced by consanguinous exploitation. The slaves had the same blood as the freemen. Imperial Rome had latterly the advantage of alien blood. Neither civilization entertained the ideal of free labour. Even the highest idealist in

these two nations supported slavery as the essential factor in the progress of civilization. The function of the freeman was to plunder, that of the slave, to produce. It was a nice division of labour. Civilization was either military or industrial. The military branch, was in the hands of free men, and the industrial branch was relegated to slaves. Even the fine arts were in the charge of the latter, and most of what makes Greece so beautiful down to the present time is the work of slaves. Slaves were divided for skilled and unskilled labour. The former had leisure and opportunities for acquiring knowledge. They were free in the sense that so long as they attended to their own duties, they were free from the gnawing. anxieties incident to finding food, clothes and shelter by their own exertions, while their work was irksome. At the present day western civilization pretends to have more respect for the artist than for the soldier, for industry than for military operations. Herbert Spencer thinks that in the order of time industrial civilization succeeds military civilization and is therefore more esteemable. In this sense the slaves of Greece, particularly those engaged in the fine arts, are more esteemable than the military heroes. At all events in the progress of Greek civilization slaves were given different ranks. There must have been formed something similar to classes or castes among them and the highest classes of slaves would appear to have lived comfortable lives, so far as such lives are possible without political freedom. Indian society of the present day may be compared to the slave society of Greece. Many an Indian lives as comfortable a life as any Britisher. A barrister's income is higher than that of the Viceroy ; his intellectual abilities may be quite as high as those of the best Britisher at home or abroad. But with all that he carries the badge of bondage hanging to his neck. The meanest white man enjoys privileges which he cannot aspire to. The most comfortable Indians with high incomes and higher intellectual calibre are contented with their position in Society. A few loathe such incomes and comforts and prefer to live in huts, though palaces are open to them ; and wear coarse clothes and eat coarse food, though they can command the finest products of the sartorial or culinary art. Their aspirations have taken a new direction. They loathe to be remembered as the best slaves of Greece, and love to live as the meanest freemen.

It will appear that while the generic name of slave was retained in Greece to the end, there was great unlikeness between one slave

and another, classes and ranks being implicity formed in the slave branch of society, similar to classes and ranks which undoubtedly existed among free men in that ancient world. The Greek population was in fact divided into two primary castes, *viz.*, the caste of freemen and the caste of slaves. The freemen were Brahmins and Kshatriyas. And slaves were Vaisyas and Sudras of the Hindu social system. A slave might occasionally become free as a Vaisya or a Sudra might become a Brahmin. Of course there was nothing to prevent a freemen from becoming a slave, as there was nothing to prevent a Brahmin from becoming a Sudra or Vaisya. However such exchange, we may be sure, was rare.

EXPLOITATION OF NEIGHBOUR IN THE MIDDLE AGES.

North-Western Europe, which began life with the fall of the Roman Empire, was, in the beginning divided into the two castes of freemen and slaves. But their social progress took a different form. The slaves were first turned into serfs, and the serfs were in course of time turned into villeins. The villeins gradually became yeomen, and yeomen became gentlemen. This was the form in which social progress advanced. In practical life towards the close of the middle ages slaves, serfs, villeins, yeomen and gentlemen subsisted simultaniously, and only the partition walls were thinner and lower than in the Hindu caste system. Down to the end of the eighteenth century serfs were all but indistinguishable from slaves. In some respects their condition was worse than that of the latter, *e.g.*, in respect of the necessities of life. They worked as hard as slaves and ate worse food and wore cast off rags, while there was no body responsible for their health and life except themselves. Herbert Spencer believed such gossip as came from America before the civil War of secession, regarding the estimation in which the emancipated Negro was held by the bond slave of the same race, who, it is said, showed his contempt for the former by exclaiming, "there goes the man who has no master to take care of him". Most serfs in France might have reasonably envied the slave in the same way if only their psychology were agreeable. However all over Europe as a matter of principle, slavery became all but non-existent shortly before Columbus and other adventurers began to scour the oceans in quest of new lands.

COLUMBUS AND HIS PSYCHOLOGY.

The moral psychology with which Columbus landed in the New World was primarily teleological Darwinism. There is an anarchronism involved in this statement. But Darwin only discovered what already existed in the heart of Europe, *viz.*, the firm conviction that the world was meant to be the ultimate play ground for the fittest for survival. It was an amphitheatre for gladiatorial exhibitions, triumphs and cheers. This psychology was re-inforced in the Spanish mentality by the success which the Spaniards had recently achieved in their contest with the Moroccans who after seven centuries of domination in Spain had been, less than a year before Columbus' departure from Barcelona, finally expelled from the country. Spain had proved herself fit for survival against the dreaded Moroccans. She was fit for survival against the other Christians powers, and surely against Kublai Khan, who ruled an unknown country with illimitable possessions in portable gold, but not being Christian lacked the power of Divine grace and was therefore too weak to resist the onslaught of a Christian power divinely equipped with the necessary moral energy required for ascendancy. There was a strong mixture of perverted Christianity and pragmatic chauvinism in Columbus' psychology. He was inspired by the complex desire for wealth, power and divine grace, which last could be secured only by faith. A pious man actively engaged in the complicated affairs of the world is a dangerous character. He believes in God, in His grace and preferential treatment rendered to the faithful, in His power of condoning and pardoning offenders against the law of nature as well as the Decalogue. He need have no respect for the sermon on the mount which prescribes a costly procedure of life, beset with insurmountable difficulties at every point, and has therefore less chance of bringing salvation than faith, which appeals to a personal God, made of the same stuff as man, as evidenced by the Book of Genesis which says that man was made in the image of God. For him the interests of the other world are secured, and for the purpose of gratifying his ambitions he need not be trammelled by those mean fetters of moral scruples which torment the heart and hinder the adventures of the sceptic. The psychology of Columbus, of almost every white man that left the shores of Europe in ships bound for America, extending over centuries, until the abolition of slavery was anticipated by the swarms

of immigrants, who, oppressed by the power of the dismal devil at home and destitute of worldly ambitions, preferred to pour into the new world in quest of wages and bare subsistance, that is to say, until the hope of wealth and comfort gave way to the fear of premature death as the inspiring angel of the activities of human life. This was the period when in the personnel of the immigrants there were substituted, for men who had failed to eat bread in the sweat of other peoples' faces, such men as had failed to eat bread in the sweat of their own faces, nay, even by sweating for others ; that is to say, when unemployment replaced ambition as the motive force of emigration. This psychology was irrespective of nationality, and of religion which was soon divided between Catholicism and Protestantism, for Luther had substituted justification by works for justification by faith ; christian faith and primitive pragmatism have maintained their union down to this day.

Christian Faith and Pragmatic Faith.

Christian Faith in the forgiveness of God super-imposed upon the "ape and tiger" quality of the Nordic race has endowed Western civilization with tooth and claw that have never lost their redness—has made that civilization the most glorious in the world. This I think, is what Benjamin Kidd means by the "Ultra-rational sanction of christianity which in alliance with the Darwinian law of development, has enabled western civilization to march, with mystic steps, forward and ever forward". Strange credit bestowed on Christ and his crucifixion by a Christian ! But Christ himself is not likely to accept this flattering revelation of his mission—this extreme unction in his distress floundering against contemptuous agnosticism. Christianity has need to be saved from her friends ! In the same fashion another Christian, more sedate and philosophic than Kidd, *viz.*, Professor Wundt, gives God credit for blessing mankind by means of a curse. He says :—"No curse could ever have proved itself so rich a blessing as the curse recorded in the biblical story of creation : 'in the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat thy bread'. Man has grown to be a moral being ; and he owes this growth not least to the fact that for him the earth is not a paradise," (page 299, *The Facts of the Moral Life*). Is not the avowed mission of Western civilization to turn this world into a paradise ? To what moral degradation is Western Civilization trying to hurry down man ?

What man has grown to be a moral being by the curse? Is it the man who evades the curse and eats bread in the sweat of other peoples' faces, or the man who sweats for others, and yet fails to eat an adequate quantity of bread? For whom has the curse proved to be a blessing? Having dethroned Christianity, Christians are crucifying Christ once again on the Calvary hill of Science. Did Christ mean by the kingdom of God on earth the empire established by western civilization throughout the earth? Is it possible to identify the moulding potentialities of the sermon on the mount with the power of steam and electricity which has enabled man to have a clearer conception of humanity in the flesh by annihilating geographical distance? Is it reasonable to identify the universal hate which brings humanity together for purposes of exploitation with the universal love preached by Christ divinely designed to bring men together in the spirit? To associate the book of Genesis and the Gospels with the *Origin of Species* and the *Descent of Man* for the purpose of showing that western civilization has advanecd by the united power of Christianity and Natural Selection is tantamount to avowing that the promised second advent of Christ stealthily happened in the middle of the last century when Christ appeared masked as Darwin, and Paul as Spencer—Huxley having, Peter-like, denied him at the last moment by his Romanes lecture on Evolution and Ethics.

It would be disingenuous to show undue deference to the taste of the reader by here resisting the temptation to expose the real source of the fallacy by which theology and sociology are attempted to be sarcastically reconciled by modern Rationalism. Christianity has been defeated and rejected in practical life by the aggressive violence of western science, but Christian theology has never been more cruelly humiliated than by apologetics covertly trying to elevate it into fallacious concordance with Darwinian biology and Spencerean sociology. To represent the curse of Adam as the primitive mode of enunciating the theory of the struggle for existence, and the ascendancy of the ethics of western civilization as the regaining of paradise may furnish proof of human ingenuity in casuistry but the eastern mentality which created the biblical idea of paradise, of its loss and recovery, will take a long time to fall into line with a mode of thinking which follows its own choice and convenience in alternately regarding "man" as the collective personality of mankind and as a mere individual of the meanest significance in the

creation of Nature, which is not deterred by irrefragable facts of sentient experience even from regarding the aggregate of Humanity as of less moment than its collective personality, to say nothing of the aggregate of the majority of mankind. The sufferings of the curse of Adam, now camouflaged into the struggle for existence, are borne by millions of individual men, women, and helpless children for numberless generations, while the blessings of the moral life, of the regained paradise and the Spencerian Utopia are enjoyed by man as the collective personality of humanity. Further, that ultimate condition of man, visualized nowhere except in the fertile imagination of the man of science, though admittedly one which can be continually approached but never reached by man, is now being fore-tasted by a small fragment of humanity which by a spurious jugglery of thought passes for the entire collective personality of mankind. The error lies, it seems, in identifying a small residuary abstract personality with the total collective personality of humanity, which last may be regarded as an eternal being without beginning or end, *i.e.*, free from the limitations of birth and death. Many individuals suffer for the benefit of one individual. Many classes in a society suffer for the benefit of one class. Many races suffer for the benefit of one race. The "Many" are concealed behind the cloud, while the "one" is brought into conspicuous prominence. The reality of the method is minimized while the ideality of the "end" is magnified for the purpose of destroying real fear and creating false hope. The gospel of spurious optimism is the revelation of the devil, preached for concealing pessimistic actualities behind the screen of camouflaged potentialities—for concealing the suffering of the rejected majority of mankind behind the possibilities of enjoyments reserved for a small residuary minority at the fag-end of Eternity with the additional prospect (revealed by another science) of the sun cooling down to a point which will turn the earth into a travelling church-yard.

THE FOUNDATION OF CIVILIZATION.

All civilizations so far in the history of the world have been founded upon the desire for the evasion of the curse of Adam, and their development has depended upon the strength of this desire combined with the power to gratify it. In other words, exploitation is the foundation upon which rests and thrives civilization.

Western civilization has thriven most because exploitation has been most widespread and penetrative in its operation. All civilizations are at start and at bottom immoral. Western civilization tops them in that respect. The ultimate aim of civilization is to attain to the highest moral perfection. The aim of western civilization too seems to be the same. Whether it will ever attain that perfection is problematical. But it is certain that down to the present day the ethics of that civilization has shown nothing compared with its intellectual development. There are some philosophers who think that instead of advancing it is, as a whole, receding; that though individuals in their natural behaviour show great progress, the collective personalities of group-life morally behave as if they were in the primitive tribal state, and that the abnormal, nay, the monstrous development of intellectuality has served only to deepen the natural sentiments and instincts of cosmic life, and to make them more effective against similar personalities developed under dissimilar circumstances. The value of the morality of the individual personality, nay, the aggregate value of the morality of the individuals of a group is as nothing compared with the value of the morality of the corporate personality of that group. Here lies the secret of the abnormal progress of western civilization. It is brilliant to look at. It is rotten inside. It is a state organised with strong muscles and nerves, but weak and vicious at heart, while it is distinguished for reckless, adventurous propensities, which bring it glory but are fraught with danger—the danger, common to all thrilling adventures, of pressure on the heart.

The conflict between the morality of the individual and that of collective personality may end in one of two ways: (1) In the triumph of the morality of the individual or (2) in the victory of the morality of the group-life. In the first case western civilization will lose its distinctive traits and gradually veer towards the civilization of the east. In the other case the antagonism between different group-personalities, national or communal, will lead to decadence and ruin. The recent course of history points to this latter conclusion.

The value of a civilization depends upon a combination of the love of power, the love of wealth and the love of beauty in a definite proportion In every civilization these three loves show fluctuations. In Greek civilization the love of power was greater than the

love of beauty, and the love of beauty greater than the love of wealth in its most prosperous days. The apotheosis of the love of beauty, transcending the love of power and of wealth marks the climax of civilization. It marks also the beginning of the end. The love of beauty in Greece outgrew the other two loves and led to her political downfall. In western civilization the love of wealth is outgrowing the other two loves. The love of power is fast losing its inherited dignity and worth as an end and a thing by itself. It is now valued more and more as a mere means for the gratification of the appetite for wealth. The love of beauty holds the lowest place in the heart of this civilization. It glories in the abundance of comforts and convenience, the outcome of the love of wealth helped by the love of power. Its adventures and expansions have been prompted by the first, and its success has been attained by the second love.

Who opened the gates of the new world where wealth lay actually and potentially in as great profusion as in the famous Valley into which Sinbad the Sailor was dropped by the Eagle, which carried a Snake in the claw? It was Columbus who opened these gates. He has obtained imperishable renown in the history of Western civilization and he deserves more. He was the pioneer in exploitation. I shall therefore dwell upon his experiences, as the founder of the most characteristic aspect of western civilization. His adventures were prompted by the love of wealth and the love of power. He enjoyed the highest glories of western life, and suffered the lowest depths of humiliation. The vicissitudes in the fortunes of western civilization bid fair to be similarly distributed and that makes the life of Columbus more interesting still.

COLUMBUS AND HIS EXPLOITATIONS.

Columbus was a Genoese by birth and was born about the year 1450. He was a student at the University of Pavia. He preferred a life of adventure on the sea to the drudgery of his father's trade of wool-carding at Genoa, and actually started on his nautical career before he was fifteen years old. He traversed a large part of the known world, visited England and made his way to Iceland and Friesland. "I have been seeking out the secrets of nature for forty years," he says, "and wherever ship has sailed, there have I voyaged." He had a commanding presence, was above the middle height, with a long countenance, rather full cheeks, an aquiline nose, and

light grey eyes full of expression. He was humane, self-denying, courteous. He was singularly resolute and enduring and possessed greatness and constancy of mind in adversity.

At what precise period his great idea came into his mind there are no means of ascertaining. A great invention or discovery is often like a daring leap, but it is from land to land, not from nothing to something. He studied cosmography and arrived at a fixed conclusion that there was a way by the west to the Indies. Cardinal Aliacos' *Cosmographia* impressed him deeply. "When he promised a new hemisphere," writes Voltaire, "people maintained that it could not exist, and when he had discovered it, that it had been known a long time." He was introduced by the Duke of Medina Celi to Queen Isabella who referred his plan to her confessor Fra Hernando de Talavera, who was afterwards Archbishop of Granada. The latter summoned a Junta of cosmographers to consult about the affair. These cosmographical pedants, accustomed to beaten tracks resented the insult by which Columbus was attempting to overthrow the belief of centuries. They combined to crush Columbus with theological objections—texts of scripture were adduced to refute his theory of the spherical shape of the earth, and the weighty authority of the fathers of the church was added to overthrow "the foolish idea of the existence of antipodes; of people who walk, opposite to us, with their heels upwards and their heads hanging down; where every thing is topsyturvy; where the trees grow with their branches downwards, and where it rains, hails and snows upwards." Las Cases displays wisdom when he says that the great difficulty of Columbus was, not that of teaching, but that of unteaching; not of promulgating his own theory but of eradicating the erroneous convictions of the judges before whom he had to plead his cause. The Junta decided that the "project was vain and impossible." Ferdinand and Isabella merely said that with the wars on their hands they could not undertake any new expenses. When six years later they agreed, the estimate of expenses was found to amount to £308 only. The actual amount collected for the purpose did not exceed £350. The royal treasury was too poor to give this money and the queen expressed her readiness to pledge her jewels to raise the necessary funds. The king looked rather coldly upon the propositions of Columbus. King Henry the Seventh of England when approached by the brother of Columbus showed similar coldness. "The ultimate event" remarks an author, "would

justify King Ferdinand's caution; for it would be hard to prove that Spain has derived aught but golden weakness from her splendid discoveries and possessions in the New World." This remark has a world wide eternal value. The law of the heterogeneity of ends is mysterious in its operations and it would be premature to judge the value of western civilization by its present success.

An agreement was executed by Columbus with the King and Queen of Spain which stipulated that Columbus should be made Admiral of the Seas, and Viceroy of all the continents and islands discovered by him, and should have a share, amounting to a tenth part of the profits of all merchandise, be it pearls and jewels or any other things that may be obtained from the discovered countries. Columbus agreed to contribute the eighth part of the expenses of the expedition.

The sovereigns authorised Columbus to press men into the service, for it was difficult to obtain crews. Eventually three vessels of small size, one hundred tons burden each, were manned with 90 mariners, and provisioned for a year. The whole number of adventurers amounted to a hundred and twenty persons of various nationalities, including among them two natives of the British Isles.

The expedition set sail on a Friday, the 3rd of August, 1492. The day on which Columbus landed in the new world was also a Friday, *viz.*, the 12th of October, 1492.

Columbus clad in complete armour and carrying in his arms the royal banner of Spain descended upon the shores of the small island, which had first greeted him, and which he found to be like a "garden full of trees." In numerous lines along the shore stood the simple islanders looking on with innocent amazement. The great business of the day then commenced; and Columbus, with due loyal formalities, took possession on behalf of the Spanish Monarchs, of the island (Guanahani) which he forthwith named San Salvador.

Columbus speaks of the people in his diary thus :—"Because they had much friendship for us, and because I knew they were people that would deliver themselves better to the Christian faith, and be converted more through love than by force, I gave to some of them some coloured caps and some strings of glass beads for their

necks, and many other things of little value, with which they were delighted and were so entirely ours that it was a marvel to see. They afterwards came swimming to the ships' boats where we were, and brought us parrots, cotton-threads in balls, darts and many other things and bartered them with us for which we gave them such things as bells and small glass beads. They went totally naked, as naked as their mother brought them into the world. They were well made with very good countenances, but their hair was like horse hair, their colour yellow, and they painted themselves. They neither carried arms, nor understood such things, for when swords were shown to them, they took hold of them by the blade, and hurt themselves. They ought to make faithful servants, and of good understandings, for they very quickly repeat all that is said to them, and it is believed they will easily be converted to Christianity. There was no faith or preoccupations to be destroyed, and the constructive work would proceed on flat uncovered ground. Christian mission work has always succeeded in such ground and has almost invariably failed where old convictions had to be destroyed."

Near the Rio del Sal the Indians were very gentle without knowing what evil is, neither killing nor stealing.

The first Indians that Columbus met had some few gold ornaments about—"poor wretches, if they had possessed the slightest gift of prophecy they would have thrown these baubles into the deepest sea!" This exclamatory remark is made by Helps to anticipate how the New World has suffered for the possession of a little gold and how the Old World is now suffering from the possession of too much gold unequally distributed. Every man and every nation, civilized, semi-civilized or uncivilized, have good reason to throw these "baubles" into the deepest sea; and the wonder is, they do not, but stick to them till it is too late.

Of the people of another island Columbus remarks:—"They are a loving, uncovetous people, so docile in all things that I assure your Highnesses I believe in all the world there is not a better people or a better country; they love their neighbours as themselves, and they have the sweetest and gentlest way of talking in the world, and always with a smile." The admiral resolved to found a colony in this island, "having found such good will and such signs of gold." Columbus was at heart determined to annihilate both the "good will" and the "gold." Columbus wittily concludes by observing

that providence dealt with the Indians as a prudent father who has an ugly daughter, but makes up for the ugliness by the help of a large dowry. By the ugliness in this case he means the seas to be traversed, the hunger to be endured, and labours to be undertaken for securing the bride. The bride-grooms were brigands. They took possession of the dowry and assassinated the poor wife in her youth.

The second voyage consisted of seventeen vessels laden with horses and other animals and with plants, seeds and agricultural implements for the cultivation of the new countries. Artificers of various trades were engaged and a quantity of merchandise and gaudy trifles, fit for bartering with the natives, were placed on board. There was no need to press men into the service now; volunteers for the expedition were only too numerous. The fever for discovering was uinversal. Columbus was confident that he had been on the outskirts of Cathay and that the scriptural land of Havilah, the home of gold, was not far off. Untold riches were to be acquired, and probably there was not one of the 1500 persons who took ship in the squadron that did not anticipate a prodigious fortune as the reward of the voyage.

At Porto Rico they found houses and roads constructed after a civilized fashion.

At Navidad Columbus found that the little colony he had founded in his first voyage had been entirely destroyed. The fort was razed to the ground. Not one of the settlers was alive to tell the tale; Columbus was requested to rebuild the fort but he declined to restart the colony, because the disgusting licentiousness of the settlers had offended the Indians to such an extent that whereas they had at first regarded the white men as angels from heaven, now they considered them as debased profligates and disturbers of the peace, against whom they had to defend their honour and their lives.

Shortly after Columbus sent home from the Cannibal Islands some Indians as slaves. He remarked in his despatch. "For the advantage of the souls of these cannibal Indians, the more of them that could be taken the better." He suggested that the cargoes employed in carrying live-stock and other necessities from Spain be paid for by selling the slaves taken from amongst the cannibals; but their Highnesses set aside the proposition.

In one of the islands the Spaniards went straggling over the country; they consumed the provisions of the poor Indians, astonishing them by their voracious appetites; waste, rapine, injury and insult followed in their steps, and from henceforth there was but little hope of the two races living peaceably together in those parts at least upon equal terms. The Indians were now swarning about the Spaniards with hostile intent; they had passed from terror to despair. In Cibao the Indians killed eight Spanish soldiers and set fire to a house where there were forty ill. Columbus engaged the Indians in battle, routed them utterly and took a large part of them for slaves.

The Indians not daunted by the issue of this battle continued to molest the Spaniards at St. Thomas. The admiral sallied out with two hundred men and routed in battle the Indians who numbered one hundred thousand men! "In speaking of such a defeat," remarks Helps, "the modern reader must not be lavish of the words, 'cowardly', 'pusillanimous,' and the like until at least he has well considered what it is to expose naked bodies to fire arms, to the charge of the steel-clad men on horseback, and to the clinging ferocity of bloodhounds. A horrible carnage ensued upon the flight of the Indians. Many of them, being taken alive, were condemned to slavery."

The admiral resolved to secure the person of the Chief by treachery. Instructions as thoroughly base and treacherous as can well be imagined were given for the purpose of capturing him. The trick succeeded, and the chief was sent to Spain for trial, while his forces were again engaged in battle and put to flight. Some were killed; some taken prisoners; some fled to the forests and the mountains; some yielded, "offering themselves to the services of the Christians if they would allow them to live in their own ways.' Skirmishes like these must be looked upon as the origin in the Indies of slavery, vassalage, and the system of *repartimientos*. The admiral had sent four ships laden with slaves to Spain. He now took occasion to impose a tribute upon the whole population of Hispaniola. It was thus arranged:—Every Indian above fourteen years old, who was in the provinces of the mines, or near to these provinces, was to pay every three months a little bell full of gold; all other persons in the island were to pay at the same time an arroba of cotton for each person. Certain brass or copper tokens were given

to the Indians when they paid tribute; and these tokens being worn about their necks, were to show who had paid tribute. In 1496 service, instead of tribute, was demanded of certain Indian villages, whose inhabitants were ordered to work the firms in the Spanish settlements. This was the beginning of the system of *repartimientos*.

Many of the so-called free Indians of Hispaniola had, perhaps, even a worse fate than that which fell to the lot of their brethern condemned to slavery. Finding no other way of geting rid of the Spaniards they bethought them of the desperate remedy of attempting to starve the Spaniards out by not sowing or planting anything. But this is a shallow device when undertaken on the part of the greater number in any country, against the smaller. The scheme reacted upon themselves. They had intended to gain a secure though scanty sustenance in the forests and upon the mountains, but though the Spaniards suffered bitterly from famine they were only driven by it to further pursuit and molestation of the Indians, who died in great numbers of hunger, sickness and misery.

Shortly after Columbus's return home from his second voyage one Pedro Nino, a Captain of the admiral's, announced his arrival in Cadiz with a quantity of "gold in bars." A pleasant thrill vibrated through all Spain in all classes of people from the monarchs downward, at this announcement. It eventually turned out that this Nino was merely a miserable maker of jokes and that the 'gold in bars' was only represented by the Indians who composed his cargo, whose present captivity was secured by bars, and whose future sale was to furnish gold!

In 1496 Don Bartholomew Columbus sent to Spain three hundred slaves from Hispaniola. In 1497 two very injudicious edicts were published by the Catholic sovereigns, upon the advise of Columbus; one authorising the judges to transport criminals to the Indies; the other permitting those who had committed any crime to go out at their own expense to Hispaniola, and to serve for a certain time under the orders of the admiral. Three years afterwards Columbus had the inconsistency of declaring; "I swear that numbers of men have gone to the Indies who did not deserve water from God or man."

There were frequent insurrections among Indians. There was also a great insurrection among the Spaniards, who had come

out with very grand expectation and who found themselves pinched with hunger, having dire storms to encounter, and vast labours to undergo, who were restrained within due bounds by no pressure of society; who were commanded by a foreigner, or by members of his family, whom they knew to have many enemies at court. With such men, (not worthy of water) the admiral and his brothers had to get useful works of civilization maintained. On complaints lodged against Columbus by his compatriots, Roldan, the chief justice, took sides with the latter. The result was that Bobadilla, who was sent as a commissioner to make enquiries took possession of the admiral's house, summoned him before him, put him out and his brothers in chain and sent them to Spain.

Poor Columbus! his chains lay very heavily upon him. He insisted however upon not having them taken off unless by royal command, and would even keep them by him, ordering that they should be buried with him. "In these chains," remarks Helps, "Columbus is of more interest to us than when in full power as Governor of the Indies."

First as a "popular pilot," then the viceroy of a New world, alternately hoping and fearing, despondent and triumphant, he had passed through strange vicissitudes of good and evil fortune. But no two events in his life stand out in stranger contrast to each other than his return to Spain after his first voyage, and his return after the second. The Queen did not wholly excuse him, neither did she inflict any specific punishment on him. He was however not reinstated in his Government at once. Bobadilla, Roldan and associates perished in the ocean when returning to Spain. Columbus himself after making some further discoveries in the new world died at Valladolid on the 20th of May, 1506.

It will appear from the above brief account of the adventures of Columbus that gold was the primary object of his expeditions. Gold was to be obtained anyhow. If it could be obtained by simply cheating the Indians in the name of Barter nothing could be better than this civilized arrangement. If it could not be so obtained the use of force was the next best method. If gold could not be obtained in adequate quantities by these methods, other sources of wealth were to be tapped, and if necessary the Indians might be made to work like slaves, and sold like slaves; and if they showed signs of resistance they might be slaughtered without compunction.

Columbus, the King and the Queen were all obsessed with the desire for gold. Entire Spain was obsessed with this desire. The ultimate result has been that Spain has achieved a "golden weakness" among the civilized nations of Europe. The love of gold has proved to be a curse to the Spanish nation. Wherever this love has run to excess it has ruined nations. The foundation of western civilization is laid in this love, for gold is the symbol of wealth, and wealth is what sustains and develops civilization. Want creates wealth, and wealth creates wants. But the creative power of wealth is greater and more vigorous than the creative power of want. The result is that in the long run a surplus of want remains to torment mankind. Man is maddened by it. His life loses its moral value, and all his intellectuality is directed towards finding the means of allaying this maddening influence of want. He forgets the ten commandments, flings away the sermon on the mount, and runs amock among his neighbours, dishonours them, tortures them and slaughters them, until he falls down exhausted, and is carried home half-dead, disgraced, disgusted, disinebriated, disillusioned. This is the end of civilization. This has been the way in which all civilizations have ended. Old age is the time for the contemplation of God, and old age means the exhaustion and disillusion which follows from the conflict between want and wealth. The philosophy of life follows the madness of life. In its death-bed Indian civilization found solace in vedantism, Greece in Plato, and Rome in stoicism. Western civilization threatens to commit suicide before old age has crept over it to induce contemplative soporiferousness. It has lived a wild life of war and industry, of pillage and production, of grabbing and grinding, slaughtering and slaving. Its wealth is increasing fast. Its madness is coming to a climax and the world is expectantly looking for the end. Will it die without extreme unction? If it does not, what form will the last sacrament take? There is no want of philosophers in the civilized world today. But man, the individual, has lost his value and is now a mere organ of Society, and society rejects the unction of vedantism, Plato's physic and Stoicism. Some new form of solace is wanted, but it is not forthcoming.

The King and Queen of Spain, particularly the latter were unwilling to reintroduce slavery. But slaves were thrust upon them by Columbus. The monarchs found it hard to resist the

temptation of selling them for the sake of the revenue, for the slaves represented "gold in bars". They discriminated between prisoners of war and prisoners of peace. They accepted the former and showed disinclination to receive the latter. Their admiral was shrewd enough to turn peace into war. He imposed tribute upon them, pinched their backs, emptied their stomachs, fermented their brains by molestations and sword-cuts and drove them to war, and captured them as prisoners, and finally sold them as slaves. The discriminative wisdom of the monarchs saved them from hell-fire without depriving them of their profits or revenue. It must be borne in mind that wars which Columbus waged in the new world were civil wars. He had taken possession of that world on the very first morning of his arrival, by raising the royal banner of Spain on the shore of the island of Guanahani. That formality was not repeated in every island discovered, because the ceremony held at Guanahani embraced the possession of the entire new world, which had been divinely conveyed by the pope of Rome, acting as the Vicegerent of God, to the Catholic monarchs of Spain. The prisoners therefore were not, properly speaking, prisoners of War, but rebels and offenders against the state, non-co-operators, whose life, liberty and property were already at the disposal of the monarchs by right of the fact that the royal banner still flapped on the shores of Guanahani. This makes the discrimination meaningless. The rebels were not prisoners of war, but criminals and therefore liable to imprisonment and transportation with hard labour superadded. What was technically objectionable was that these criminals were sold as slaves and not made to work murally or extra murally like ordinary prisoners of jails. It may be suspected that King Ferdinand and Queen Isabella had doubts in their minds as to the legality of the possession formally taken by Columbus, and as to their right of ruling the new world. That right was surely not obtained by conquest in the beginning. The conquest came after the possession. The whole recalls to mind the philosophic discourse dialogued between St. Mael and Monk Bullock in Anatole France's *Penguin Island*. I give below part of the discourse believing it to be interesting and instructive sociologically and juridically :—

"Whilst the Monk Bullock, was pronouncing these words a big penguin with a fair skin and red hair went down into the valley carrying a trunk of a tree upon his shoulder. He went up to a little

penguin who was watering his vegetables in the heat of the sun and shouted to him ; "your field is mine". And having delivered himself of this stout utterance he brought down his club on the head of the little penguin, who fell dead upon the field that his own hands had tilled.

"At this sight the holy Mael shuddered through his whole body and poured forth a flood of tears, and in a voice stifled by horror and fear he addressed this prayer to heaven :—

'O Lord, My God, O thou who didst receive young Abel's sacrifices, thou who didst curse Cain, avenge, O Lord, this innocent penguin sacrificed upon his own field and make the murderer feel the weight of thy arm. Is there a more odious crime, is there a grosser offence against thy justice, O Lord ! than this murder and this robbery ?'

"Take care, Father," said Bullock, gently "that what you call murder and robbery may not really be War and conquest, those sacred foundations of empires, those sources of all human virtues and all human greatness. Reflect above all, that in blaming the big penguin you are attacking property in its origin and in its source. I shall have no trouble in showing you how. To till the land is one thing, to possess it is another, and these two things must not be confused. As regards ownership the right of the first occupier is uncertain and badly founded. The right of conquest, on the other hand, rests upon more solid foundations. It is the only right that receives respect since it is the only one that makes itself respected. The sole and proud origin of property is force—in that it is august and yields only to a greater force. This is why it is correct to say that he who possesses is noble. And that big red man, when he knocked down a labourer to get possession of his field, founded at that moment a very noble home upon this earth. I congratulate him upon it."

Having thus spoken Bullock approached the big penguin, who was leaning upon his club as he stood in the blood-stained furrow :—

"Lord Greatauk, dreaded prince", said he, bowing to the ground, "I am to pay you the homage due to the founder of legitimate power and hereditary wealth. The skull of the vile penguin you have overthrown will, buried in your field, attest for ever for the sacred rights of your posterity over this soil that you have ennobled.

Blessed be your sons and your sons' sons! They shall be Greatauks, Dukes of Skull, and they shall rule over this island of Alca".

In the above passage Monk Bullock artistically expounds the latest and most approved theory of the origin of right of property. It suggests also the best theory of the origin of society and of its development with all its implications of inequality, complicity, interdependance, homage and patronage, antipathy and sympathy. The big penguin and the little penguin were individuals in the state of nature; the moral life was yet non-existant. It was waiting to be created. The penguin created the germ of the moral life with the help of the trunk of a tree which he carried. The only point open to criticism in the Monk's explanation is that the use of the epithets "big" and "little" to distinguish between the two penguins is not only superfluous but misleading. They indicate the existence of an original inequality of a permanent nature existing between the two penguins. But no such permanent inequality is necessary for the purpose of enunciating the theory. The accidental possession of the trunk, the symbol of superior power in the hands of one of the penguins was enough, and it matters little whether the victorious penguin had the larger or the smaller stature between the two. The theory assumes that the victim had no trunk of tree in his possession at the time, and that is enough, nay more than enough, as no opportunity was given to the latter to resist the aggressor.

It may be urged that neither the Indians nor the Spaniards were in the state of nature at the time when Columbus took possession of the new world at Guanahani. But down to the present time, although individuals show more or less ethical progress, group-life is on the same dead-level throughout the world. Nations are in the state of nature still. Their ethical condition was, if possible, worse in the fifteenth century, when western civilization was only trying to be born. Gunpowder was the determining factor in the assertion of Spanish right to the new world, as the trunk of the tree was in the more ancient instance adverted to by the great French Savant.

It will be remembered also that slavery does not slowly come into being in society, but marks the very beginning of its growth. It is born with the birth of society, and it develops with the development of the latter. It assumes different forms and names at different

stages of social progress. It begins with the distinction between those who have and those who have not, and ends with the same, it may be, more or less slightly modified. Names do not matter. The foundation of society is laid in a simple antitheses, by whatever name we may call it. This antithesis is sometime between master and slave, Capital and labour, feudal chief and serf, landlord and tenant, etc. Civilization may create intermediate classes, but all bats are either birds or animals and behave as the one or the other whenever any important dispute has to be settled. The life and liberty of the slave are at the disposal of the master. The Indians have disappeared from the face of the earth ; and people are apt to suggest that the master did not use his discretion wisely in exterminating them. More recently Negro slaves have been emancipated in America ; and some people suspect that it would have been better for them to have disappeared like the Indians. These are questions of opinion only. The progress of civilization does not wait for the verdict of man. It moves by the pressure of its own weight. This however is not the place to deal with the problem.

Further, I shall state here that the Spaniards are responsible only for the beginning of American civilization. Further development took place under the guidance and control of other nationalities. There are "Dukes of Skull" still ruling the continent ; but they are not the descendents of the original "Duke". They have changed their manners and methods, but the original moral sentiments still retain their pristine purity. There may have been a little adulteration here and there, and camouflaged explanations may have been advanced by historians and Jurists, but the main structure is unaltered. It is still truly gothic in its character and architecture.

Columbus was the father of western civilization in more senses than one. He was the pioneer explorer. He was the pioneer exploiter. He was the pioneer who broke the fangs of official Christianity which resisted the progress of science. It was he who pointed out that the earth was a sphere and not a flat rectangular structure surrounded by walls of mountains from one of which the sun rose and in another the sun set. Official Christianity formerly believed that the earth was at the centre of the universe and that the firmament with the sun, moon and stars moved round it. It probably had

no belief regarding the position where God's will was supreme and where He had his throne surrounded by angels and whence Christ descended in glory upon earth. The axe was laid at all these beliefs by the theory on which Columbus based his conviction that the empire of the Grandkhan in the east could be approached by continually sailing towards the west. The theory was discussed by a Junta of clerical cosmographers and rejected by them as obscure and destructive of Faith in Christianity. But the greed of gold was the supreme passion of Europe. Isabella and Ferdinand had no difficulty in persuading themselves that the earth was spherical because the new world offered chances of hitherto undiscovered gold. The discovery of gold and not the discovery of a new hemisphere was their primary object. Columbus was regarded as an Ali Baba. Even the Pope was coaxed out of his apostolic convictions by the greed of gold, for without his permission and testament the catholic monarchs could never have ventured to send ships out on the deep sea to discover new land, and a new truth so destructive of Christian faith. Giordano Bruno and Galileo suffered for this poisonous truth even long afterwards, probably because they offered no promise of gold. It is not impossible that the revolt of Christendom as represented by the reformation had exacerbated the Pope, who inspite of the advantages derived from the discoveries of Columbus, was determined to arrest the growth of truths which threatened to deprive him of the church dues of Europe. Here too gold was set against gold, Church revenue against American gold. The Pope still lives, but the time of which I am speaking was critical for Popedom. It has escaped by giving up half, but the whole of it, stock lock and barrel, was in danger at the time. Spain has suffered for heresy. She has acquired a golden weakness by the discoveries of Columbus. The other nations of Europe went over to America after the reformation had finally set aside the Christian cosmography as supported by the Pope, and no charge of hypocrisy can be laid against them. It is difficult to say whether western civilization has gained more by Columbus's discoveries of land or by his discovery of the truth of science which rendered the discovery of land possible. Columbus was in error in his geodetical calculations about the position of the empire of the Grandkhan. But the eorrr has been permanently consecreted by the common consent of Europe which still gives the name of the Indies to the new world, qualified by the epithet "West".

THE DISMAL DEVIL'S GLARE IN THE DARK—VII.

NEGRO SLAVERY.

Negro slaves existed in Spain as far back as 1442 A.D. when they were obtained in exchange for Moroccan prisoners of war. The Portuguese obtained Negro slaves through Arab middlemen, who bartered horses for slaves at the rate of ten to eighteen slaves for each horse. They also obtained them in exchange for silks from Granada and Tunis, and Silver. Every year between seven and eight hundred slaves were brought to Portugal. When Indian slaves were being brought to Spain in large numbers, and shortness of labour was felt in the Indies, the Spanish monarchs permitted Negro slaves to be taken over to the New World. Thus the foundation of the slave-trade was laid by royal command—I mean the slave-trade as carried on between Africa and America.

H. G. Wells gives the following brief account of Spanish exploitation in America :—

"To begin with each story is nearly always a story of adventures and of cruelty and loot. The Spaniards ill-treated the natives, they quarrelled among themselves, the law and order of Spain were months and years away from them ; it was only very slowly that the phase of violence and conquest passed into a phase of government and settlement. But long before there was much order in America a steady stream of gold and silver began to flow across the Atlantic to the Spanish Government and people"......"After the first violent treasure hunt came plantation and the working of mines. With that arose the earliest labour difficulty in the new world. At first the Indians were enslaved with much brutality and injustice. But to the honour of the Spaniards they did not go uncriticised. An importation of Negro slaves from West Africa began quite early in the sixteenth century. After some retrogression Mexico, Brazil and Spanish South America began to develop into great slave-holding, wealth producing lands"......"So it was that Spain rose, to a temporary power and prominence in the world's affairs. It was a very sudden and very memorable rise. From

the eleventh century this infertile and corrugated peninsula had been divided against itself; Christian population had maintained a perpetual conflict with the Moors; then by what seems like an accident it achieved unity just in time to reap the first harvest of benefit from the discovery of America. Before that time Spain had always been a poor country; it is a poor country to-day, almost its only wealth lies in its mines. For a century, however, through its monopoly of the gold and silver of America, it dominated the world."

Elsewhere Wells speaks of the making of the United States thus:—"If one were to write a full, true and particular history of the making of the United States it would have to be written with charity and high spirits as a splendid comedy. And in no other regard do we find the rich tortuous humanity of the American story so finally displayed as in regard to slavery. Slavery, having regard to the general question of labour, is the test of this new soul in the world's history, the American soul"......"Slavery began very early in the European history of America, and no European peoples who went to America can be held altogether innocent in the matter."-......"American slavery began with the enslavement of Indians for gang work in mines and upon plantations, and it is curious to note that it was a very good and humane man indeed, Las Casas who urged that negroes should be brought to America to relieve his tormented Indian proteges. The need for labour upon the plantations of the West Indies and the South was imperative. When the supply of Indian captives proved inadequate the planters turned not only to the Negro, but to the jails and poor houses of Europe for a supply of toilers"......"The year (1620) that saw the Pilgrim Fathers' landing at Plymouth in New England saw a Dutch sloop disembarking the first cargo of Negroes at Jamestown in Virginia. Negro slavery was as old as New England, it had been an American institution for over a century and a half before the war of independence. It was to struggle on for the better part of a century more ...... 'All men are by nature free and equal', said the Virginian Bill of Rights, and outside in the sunshine, under the whip of the overseer, toiled the negro slaves"......"It witnesses to the great change in human ideas since the Roman Imperial system dissolved under the barbarian inrush that there could be this heart searching. Conditions of Industry, production and land tenure had long

prevented recrudescence of gang slavery; but now the cycle had come round again, and there were enormous, immediate advantages to be reaped by the owning and ruling classes in the revival of that ancient institution in mines, upon plantations, and upon great public works.... In some respects the new gang slavery was worse than any thing in the ancient world. Peculiarly horrible was the provocation given by the trade of slave wars and man hunts in Western Africa, and the cruelties of the long trans-Atlantic voyage. The poor creatures were packed on the ships with insufficient provision of food and water, without proper sanitation, without medicines. Many who could tolerate slavery upon the plantations found the slave-trade too much for their moral digestions. Three European nations were chiefly concerned in this dark business, Britain, Spain and Portugal, because they were the chief owners of the new land in America. The comparative innocence of the other European powers is to be ascribed largely to their lesser temptations. They were similar communities; in parallel circumstances they would have behaved similarly".

This last remark gives an inimitable generalisation of the ethics of western civilization. Self-interest, self-love, selfishness lies at the root of it, supported by antipathy, contempt, hatred for neighbour. Self-love established Negro Slavery in America and self-love abolished it. I intend to prove this at some length, because it is usual to ignore the fact that slavery was revived, not continued by western civilization, while great stress is laid on the morality of that civilization, which abolished it afterwards. History written by the ascendent people of the world has a meaning different from History that may be written by the suffering peoples or by outsiders. Unhappily there are no impartial outsiders now left in the world to write this history. Occasional glimpses of truth flash across the dark pages of history as written by the more cultured among the ascendent races, who have an eastern orientation in their modes of ethical thinking. Mr. Wells is one of them but the very height of his culture stands in his way when he wishes to expose in their true colour monstrosities of the civilization in which he lives. This will be evident from the quotations given above. A few instances of the cruelties practised by slave-tradeas and slave-owners will throw light on the depths to which the civilized mind of the West can sink.

"On their way across the Atlantic the poor wretches suffered horrible torments being packed as closely as the sufferers in the Black Hole of Calcutta, in nearly as stifling an atmosphere, so that large numbers died on the way".

As a matter of fact the negroes were treated as mere inanimate merchandize. There was no law to prevent this practice, and the traders regulated their conduct by the code of commercial morality which reserves the highest approbation for the largest profit. The humane trader who suffered loss would be held to just ridicule, and soon pass into the abyss of oblivion in which are now packed up the majority of mankind, according to the theory of the survival of the fittest, during the last fiftythousand years and more. Seeing that fiftythousands of Negroes were annually transported across the Atlantic, and seeing further that the slave trade lasted for two hundred years, it may be calculated that ten million Negroes of both sexes were in all treated to the horrors of the Black-Hole on the bosom of the Atlantic. Whether the proportion of the dead fell short of that of the tragedy of Calcutta is not known. The fact that the burial of the dead was inexpensive and informal probably had something to do with the indifference with which the death of a Negro was looked upon in the same way as a coster-monger looks upon a rotten fruit in his basket.

"When in 1788 a Bill was brought in by Sir William Dolben by which means were to be taken for improving the sanitary condition of the vessels carrying slaves, the slave-traders resisted it and argued that the Negroes liked being taken from their own barbarious country and danced and made merry on deck. On enquiry it transpired that they were from time to time flogged on deck in order to keep up the circulation of the blood in their numbed limbs, and that what their tyrants called dancing was merely their shrinking from the lash. The slave-traders were poets, and they carried their art into practical life and politics with a grim humour for which the people of Caledonia are specially distinguished in British literature. The humour fell upon good soil and bore fruit, for though the bill was passed in the lower house the Lords so changed it as to make it useless. In 1789 and 1790 Wilberforce urged the Commons to abolish the wicked slave trade entirely, and in 1792 Pitt spoke vehemently in support of the proposal, but the House of Commons refused to accept it. The men of property of whom the House was

composed thought that the first duty of legislators was to protect property, whether it was property in human beings or in houses and goods."

It may be mentioned here that this principle of jurisprudence was not in the least deviated from when ultimately in 1806 Fox signalised the close of his career by moving a resolution for the abolition of the slave-trade as far as British ships and colonies were concerned. On March 25, 1807, the royal assent was given to a Bill for the abolition of the slave-trade. During the eighteen years that elapsed between Dolben's Bill in 1788 and the ultimate abolition in 1807, the slave-trade had become an unprofitable business. The western coast of Africa had become denuded of population and the cost of bringing negroes from the interior was increasing to a prohibitive extent. The Northern States of America were gradually reducing their slave stock, and the Southern States introduced a system of slave-breeding which harshly competed with the trans-Atlantic importation. The slave-trade had lost its value as property and there was no real opposition to Fox's resolution, at least nothing like what Dolben's Bill had encountered in 1788. Western civilization would have been false to itself if it had allowed a profitable trade to pass out of hands under a vague influence of humane considerations. The highest principles of its ethics are based upon prevision—upon forward not upon backward vision. Their contents are economic, not theological. In a few years more the slave-trade would have died a natural death by atrophy without claiming space for its burial in the statute book of England, or such extreme unction as was administered to it by the highpriests of the House of Commons.

The entire slave-trade was thus abolished for, though for many years several natives had taken part in it, it had practically passed exclusively into the hands of the British hunters by the treaty of Assicats in 1713. Western civilization was not outwitted by the abolition of the trade. It substituted slave-breeding for slave-hunting. Abraham Lincoln deftly called it Negro-breeding. Negroes in large numbers were made with the whiteman's blood. When the whiteman takes a burden on his shoulder he carries it to its destination at any sacsifice. The slave-trade was abolished but slavery still remained. For some years Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton and Zachary Macaulay (the father of Macaulay, the historian),

had been pleading the cause of the slave. In the West Indies slaves were often subjected to brutal cruelty—to take a few instances :—a little slave girl, having dropped some cream was scolded by her mother, a slave woman named America. The master of the both of them had America flogged with no less than 175 lashes for remonstrating with her daughter, holding that as the child was his property, she ought only to have been scolded by himself or his wife. Three slave women were flogged for crying when their brother was flogged merely for sighing". When Stanley came into office, as Colonial Secretary, new as he was to the details of the subject he mastered them in three weeks, and carried in 1833 A.D. a bill for the complete abolition of slavery, though leaving the former slaves apprentices to their masters for twelve years. The purchase money given was twenty million pounds sterling. The apprentice system was found unsatisfactory, and was soon done away with.

The three instances of cruelty gathered from Gardiner's history of England are fraught with the deepest psychological and economic significance. The Englishman is not cruel by nature, and at the same time we may be sure that the instances do not stand by themselves either as poetic exaggerations or as accidental manifestations of brutality. Such occurrences were becoming common. They involved a question of policy. Their very nature will show that sudden outburst of passion was not the motive force but a deep rooted conviction that the slave-women were becoming self-conscious, that is to say, that they were becoming conscious of their natural rights as mothers and sisters. This self-consciousness was badly in need of being smothered if slave labour was to retain its accustomed profitableness. A self-conscious slave is a dangerous creature. He cannot be killed because his death means loss to his master. If he neglects his work his wages must still be paid, consisting, of course, of food, clothing and shelter. If flogging sends him to bed his services are lost for the time being and the account of profit and loss would cause more mental anguish to the master who gave the flogging than to the slave who received it. If flogging was ever inflicted it was done in cold blood, and if there was any heat, it was derived from the calculation of gain and loss, and not from natural indignation or divine retribution. Slavery is profitable only so long as the slave remains unaware of his natural rights, such as the right of the mother to scold her child, the right of the

sister to cry when her brother is tortured or to sigh when he is flogged. The self-consciousness whose existence is indicated by the exercise of the rights of scolding, crying and sighing, was fast spreading among the entire slave population, and was surely also manifesting itself in ways deeply detrimental to the financial position of the masters. Slavery and self-consciousness are bad bed fellows. They form a poisoned mixture which gives the slave owner no peace of mind, makes his life a burden to him, and makes him wish he never had slaves. The slaves were ceasing to be property, *i.e.*, useful sources of gratification, and were fast assuming the character of encumbrances. The present was melancholy, the future was heart-breaking. In a few years they would find it profitable to emancipate the slaves, and throw them upon their own resources by way of punishment for their cussedness. They therefore readily accepted the twenty million pounds lavished upon them by the government of the country. It would be interesting to know how many members of the House of Commons and the House of Lords were interested in the plantations of the Colonies affected by the abolition of slavery. That would enable history to appreciate the true nature of the charity which the British people showed to the Negro-slaves. In 1788 A.D. the year in which the Bristol and Liverpool merchants, who had made a profit of several million pounds by the slave-trade, resisted the amelioration of that trade—a resistance which was too strong for government to bear. How in the course of 18 years the psychology of the people had a deflection of such magnitude, from meanness to greatness, it is difficult to understand and then how in 25 years more the old psychology was turned wholly topsy-turvy is a mystery which will ever arouse suspicion but may possibly successfully ward off direct blows of historical light. Such a sudden change in national psychology is more difficult to comprehend than a change in the psychology of a subject race claiming Autonomy for a nation of three hundred million souls which have lived for many centuries under foreign domination. It is easier to believe that a watch which was 15 minutes too slow last evening is going 15 minutes too fast this morning, than to realize the drastic change in the national psychology implied by the abolition of slavery. The only possible explanation is that people were convinced in the course of the interval between 1788 and 1833, not that the slave-trade or slavery was immoral, but that they were either unprofitable or that their profitableness was a rapidly diminishing quality. It is possible

individual planters who treated their slaves with considerateness and thereby arrested a too rapid growth of their self-consciousness, expected to make good profits out of slavery for sometime longer but on the whole it is reasonable to think that legislative interference noisily anticipated what *laissez faire* would have quietly accomplished in a few years more. That there were considerate men among the planters of the southern states of the United States is evident from *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, which calls pointed attention to more than one such character, one of whom particularly unduly indulged his slaves, to compensate for his wife's temperament which had lost its human worth by love of repose and luxury. Their daughter was an angel and was loved as such by the slaves of the house hold. One can never forget the lofty indifference of this gentleman, the peevishness of his wife or the heavenly sweetness that characterised the child. It is a paradox in the history of Negro slavery that while harsh treatment tended to abolition, kindness made for its perpetuation.

In 1788 there were fifteen thousand slaves in England employed in domestic service, thereby giving considerable relief to a section of the population, who were troubled by the constant migration of people from the south to the north of England where the new mechanical revolution was drastically changing the condition of labour by causing a redistribution of population all over the country. The general interest of the middle classes in the cause of slavery received a shock by the judgment of Lord Mansfield which declared that a slave could not breathe in England. The political opposition to slavery came overtly from people whose moral sentiments were unaffected by the prospect of material gain or loss. What amount of covert opposition came from those whose material interests were affected cannot be determined. It seems fair to conclude however that those who were impressed by the growing economic weakness of slave labour caused by the increasing self-consciousness among the slaves were fain to be relieved of their burden at public cost.

It may be remarked also that by the time slavery was abolished the Dismal Devil was energetically engaged in his mission work, inspite of, rather by the instrumentality of, the mechanical revolution. Population was increasing fast, and wages were falling, and unemployment was increasing. The whiteman was crying for bread and the drudgery of slaves. The population was crying for relief

from the growing pressure exerted by the Dismal Devil. Negro slavery had very little chance against this rapidly growing white pressure. As a fact of history we know that while the British legislature abolished slavery in the British Colonies the surplus population of Britain, particularly of Ireland, quietly abolished slavery in the Northern States of America. The struggle for existence, the Devil's method of selection (not natural selection which refers to lower forms of life) was violently shaking society and political psychology in the civilized world, and the redundant people of Europe, who were, for centuries, accustomed to cross the Atlantic for the purpose of exploiting others and to eat bread in the sweat of the faces of others were now swarming into the trans-Atlantic continent in quest of bread at the cost of their own perspiring faces. It is thus that the Dismal Devil befriended the negro, and emancipated him from the shackles which had tormented him for centuries. His services are generally unrecognized and the abolition of slavery has been traced to the mysterious influence of the sermon on the mount, for which Western civilization has shown very little respect elsewhere. I have dwelt upon this aspect of the abolition of slavery *literally* to "*give the devil his due*".

The following extract from Henry George's "Social Problems", Chapter III, will be found interesting :—

"The trees as I write, have not yet begun to leaf nor even the blossoms to appear ; yet passing down the lower part of Broadway these early days of spring, one breasts a steady current of uncouthly dressed men and women, carrying bundles and boxes and all manner of baggage. As the season advances the human current will increase, even in winter it will not wholly cease to flow. It is the great gulf stream of humanity which sets from Europe upon America —the greatest migration of people since the world began. Other minor branches has the stream—Into Boston and Philadelphia, into Portland, Quebec and Montreal, into New Orleans, Galveston, San Fransisco and Victoria come offshoots of the same current, and as it flows it draws increasing volume from wider sources. Emigration to America has, since 1848, reduced the population of Ireland by more than a third. But as Irish ability to feed the stream declines English emigration increases, the German outpour becomes so vast as to assume the first proportions, and the millions of Italy, pressed by want as severe as that of Ireland, begin to turn

to the emigrant ship as did the Irish. In Castle Garden one may see the garb and hear the speech of all European peoples. From the Fjords of Norway, from the mountains of Wallachia, and from Mediterranian shores and Islands, once the centre of classic civilization, the great current is fed. Every year increases the facility of its flow......yet inspite of this great exodus the population of Europe as a whole is steadily increasing".

This is the character and dimensions of the army transported by the Dismal Devil across the Atlantic to fight negro slavery, and to emancipate the blacks by putting the whites in fetters to ransom the African in exchange for the European. So great has been the onslaught of Fate that even America with her vast waste lands, has been compelled to acknowledge her gratitude to the Devil and to exclaim "Enough, Enough" in the shape of exclusion acts passed in the legislatures. This is how the Dismal Devil achieves his purpose, and leaves it to the ingenuity of the world to give credit to his enemy's son who arrogantly insulted him when he had offered to make him the Emperor of the world.

The story of the abolition of slavery in America is slightly different in detail from the story as told for England. In the constitution of the Commonwealth which was prepared in 1786 there is no mention of slaves though the foundational principle of it was that "all men are born free and equal". Dolben's Bill for improving the sanitary condition of the ships in which slaves were carried, it will be remembered, was defeated in the House of Lords in 1788. It was urged that slaves were private property, and no legislature could interfere to abolish property. No doubt in Russia they have abolished it in 1917. But a sufficiently long time had elapsed since the slave holders discussed natural and Roman jurisprudence in the House of Lords, to enable Russian psychology to undergo a drastic orientation. It seems that the psychology of the English speaking people was the same on the west of the Atlantic as on the east about the time to which the present discussion relates, and it is no wonder slaves were considered as property on both sides of the ocean towards the close of the Eighteenth Century. In England the slave-trade ceased to be property, *i.e.*, a source of profit, in 1806. But America is a large country, north and south as well as east and west. Many degrees of latitude and longitude are included in it. The northern twothirds is cold and the southern third is wet. There is a middle region with medium thermal conditions

Opinion regarding slavery soon came to be divided. The north formally declared against it. The south was determined to retain it. The middle region sat on the fence. The abolition of the slave-trade by England had probably a mixed motive behind it. The Commonwealth of America derived more benefit from the slave-trade than England. English statesmen thought that slave labour might be easily replaced in the colonies by indentured labour imported from the vast possessions which England commanded in the tropics. As a matter of fact this source of labour soon began to be tapped, and now India furnishes most of the labour required for the plantations in the West Indies, which were alone affected by the abolition of slavery in 1833. The condition of the Southern States of America was different. The abolition of slavery led to diminution of labour and they had no means of replenishing. No Irishman would go to South Carolina to sweat for his bread. America was an enemy to England. She had defeated her in War and turned her out of America proper. The principles of jealousy and hate probably suggested that it would be statesmanlike to inflict a greater injury on an enemy by incurring a smaller injury to oneself. Whether thinking in England actually proceeded on this line cannot be ascertained, but the ethics of Western civilization are quite in accord with it. Uninstructed school boys are very much impressed by the folly of cutting one's nose to spite an enemy. They are not enlightened enough to see that the adage implies greater and more certain injury inflicted on self as compared with that inflicted on the neighbour. War recognizes the legitimacy of the ethics indicated above, particularly Tariff-War. For though this kind of war pretends to look to the ultimate benefit of one's own nation, its immediate purpose is to cause injury to another nation or to other nations, specifically pointed to. The law of the survival of the fittest, the law of gladiatorial life thoroughly justifies it. Self-disregarding mentality is virtuous when it is accompanied by a greater disregard for the interests of neighbours. In other cases as explained in the preceding section, it is a vice. This dictum of Western ethics is generally overclouded, for noodles and molly-coddles, by the higher principle which distinguishes between immediate good and ultimate benefit, and gives to the latter the higher value, while at the same time it points to the wisdom of incurring immediate loss for the sake of ultimate gain. There are hills behind hills—an interminable series of hills, alternating with valleys deep or shallow, broad or narrow.

Dolben's Bill did not directly aim at the abolition of the slave-trade. Ostensively it rested on human sympathy, but its indirect effect was to make the slave-trade unprofitable and thereby to deprive slavery of its value as property. It failed for the time being, but it discouraged the slave-traders and had thus an educative effect. Slaves themselves were becoming rare on the western coast of Africa, and sooner or later the slave-trade was bound to disappear. The planters in America foresaw the disappearance and took time by the forelock. They maintained the slave population by slave-breeding. The slave-breeding was costly as compared with the importation system. A slave woman who had conceived had to be taken out of work for some months. There were the risks of death in the creation of another life. So the slave owners did not like sexual intercourse between male and female slaves. But when the worse comes to the worse the whiteman instead of being overwhelmed by despair shows extraordinary resourcefulness. In the present he did not wholly depend upon slave men for the purpose of slave procreation. Besides there was the risk of demoralisation and physical relaxation. The mule is preferred to the full-horse for certain purposes, and the result was an amalgamation of two extreme types of blood. This amalgamation was not a new thing in the history of slavery. But what people did out of uncontrollable passion before was now turned into profitable industry carried on in a systematic way. There were mullattoes and quadroons and probably also Eur-Africans with fourteen anna white blood. If slavery had not been abolished in America there would soon arise men and women whose blood would be indistinguishable from that of white men and white women, but who would have been treated as full blooded blacks. In fact a new race of men would come into being, who had white skins, spoke English and followed christianity but who were called negroes, and were slaves by profession. They would be a puzzle to future ethnologists who would in vain try the test of colour, language or religion and who would be baffled by cephalic measurements. Evidently science would come to the conclusion that the whitemen in Europe had revived Greek slavery and that the slaves called negroes were really agnates and cognates, brought under subjection by some mysterious process. Further continuance of slave breeding industry might prove to be a national danger.

To understand the history of the abolition of slavery in America one ought to read Abraham Lincoln's speeches on the subject. It

was he for whom the abolition of slavery was literally a life and death question? He lived to accomplish it, and he died because he had accomplished it : he was assassinated for the energy and perseverance he had shown for the abolition of slavery. I shall make some illuminating excerpts from his speeches :—

"Is it not plain in what direction we are treading? In the colonial time Mason, Pendleton and Jefferson were as hostile to slavery in Virginia as Otis, Ames and the Adamses were in Massachusetts, and Virginia made as earnest an effort to get rid of it is old Massachusetts did. But circumstances were against them and they failed, but not because the good will of its leading men was lacking. Yet within less than forty years Virginia changed its tune, and *made negro-breeding for the cotton and sugar states one of its leading industries*".

This speech was made in 1865 and is known as the lost speech. The brief extract is full of significance. There is much on the surface and more below it. Inspite of the abolition of the slave-trade that is, the trade with America, the number of slaves was increasing in America, and slavery was spreading to new states. Slave-breeding became a regular industry. In Virginia it was one of the leading industries. The laughter and applause with which this declaration was met gives an indication of the manner in which the industry was carried on.

Abraham Lincoln was convinced of the national danger which this diabolical industry stood for. His object was not merely to show that slaves were increasing in numbers, and slavery was expanding in area, but he wanted to indicate how the slave population was increasing by the demoralisation of the whiteman.

"There is a natural disgust in the minds of nearly all white people at the idea of an indiscriminate amalagamation of the white and black races. Judge Douglas wants to fasten the odium of that idea upon his adversaries". This was delivered in 1857. The quotation indicates how the amalgamation was going on. Judge Dauglas's charge was that abolitionists were trying to emancipate slave women in order that they might marry them. Lincoln replied by indicating that while the philogamic instinct of the whiteman discriminated between white women and negro women, the sex instinct and the commercial instinct of the advocates of slavery were

perfectly blind to such discrimination. Further on in the same speech Lincoln observed :—

"I protest against the counterfeit logic which concludes that because I do not want a black woman for a slave, I must necessarily want her for a wife. I need not have her for either".

"In those days, as I understand, masters could at their own pleasure, emancipate their slaves but since then such legal restraint has been made upon emancipation as to amount almost to prohibition. In these days legislatures hold unquestioned power to abolish slavery in their respective states but now it is becoming quite fashionable for State Constitutions to withhold that power from the legislatures".

This last passage has reference to the Southern States and States of the middle zone, where slavery was expanding. In the Northern States slavery was non-existent either by interference of state legislature or by the goodwill of masters, and in 1856 there were four hundred and thirty-six thousand free Blacks in America.

Slavery disappeared in the north because the climate was not congenial to the negro, who often fell ill and was more frequently indisposed. He required warm clothing, costly animal-food, expensive medical attendance. The master felt worried by frequent suspension of work and by uncertainties of the future. There was no extensive plantation in the north requiring gang labour, while for domestic work the white women, born and brought up under circumstances in which the curse of Adam acted like a blessing, preferred even in plenty to enjoy work as pastime and hated idelness as a sin which visited the sinner with due punishment here as well as hereafter. As explained in a previous section this was the period when the settlers in the north enjoyed real domestic happiness, and lived as christians out of home. The state of things changed when plenty of bread roused the desire for cake and God walked out in proportion as the devil walked in. Slavery came in plenty. It was not long before white free labour became available. The Devil that had roused the desire for cake had been actively at work in Europe where men and women in large increasing numbers wanted bread. The latter came out in quest of it across the Atlantic, and drove out the blacks towards the south. The masters in the north sold their slaves to dealers coming from the South,

which was taboo to the new army of immigrants, and used the sale money as capital for business on which free labour was employed. Capital and labour are in one respect like the sun and light. It is an unsettled point of dispute in science which came into existence first. The same dispute still troubles the philosophers of economics regarding capital and labour. In North America the labour of free and Christian men and women created capital and capital created slave labour first and free labour afterwards. Being relieved of the necessity, to a large extent if not wholly, of slave labour the north began to denounce slavery as sinful. Mr. Wells gives credit to German culture for launching the crusade against slavery. He says, "at a time when Germany is still the moral whipping boy of Europe it is well to note that the German record is in this respect the best of all. Almost the first outspoken utterances against Negro slavery came from the German settlers in Pennsylvania. But the German settler was working with free labour upon a temperate countryside well north of the plantation zone ; he was not under serious temptation in this matter". What credit is here bestowed on distinctive German culture on the one hand is immediately snatched off by the other. Mr. Wells might well have put it thus :—Western civilization is a civilization of profit and loss, of self-love and hate for neighbour, of camouflage and pretentious piety. Slavery was unnecessary in the north and therefore it was abolished in the north. Slavery was necessary in the south ; therefore it continued in the south and excited the piety of the north where people began strenuously to fight against it.

The following extracts from Wells' *Outline of History* will be useful ; "South of the Mason and Dixon line tobacco growing began and the warmer climate encouraged the establishment of plantations with gang labour. The red Indian captives were employed. Cromwell sent Irish prisoners of War to Virginia ; convicts were sent out and there was considerable trade in kidnapped children, who were spirited away to America to become apprentices or bond slaves. But the most convenient form of gang labour proved to be that of Negro Slaves. The first Negro Slaves were brought to Jamestown in Virginia by a Dutch ship as early as 1620. By 1700 Negro Slaves were scattered all over the states, but Virginia, Maryland and Carolina were their chief regions of employment, and while the communities to the North were communities of not very rich and not very poor farming men, the south developed a type of large proprietors and

a white community of overseers and professional men subsisting on slave labour. Slave labour was a necessity to the social and economic system that had grown up in the south, in the north the presence of slaves was unnecessary and in some respects inconvenient. Conscientous scruples about slaves were more free, therefore, to develop and flourish in the northern atmosphere."

The south required labour in three different ways : it required (1) gang labour (2) tropical labour and (3) inexpensive labour. Negro slavery admirably fulfilled these conditions, and they fought strenuously for slavery against the half real, half-counterfeit scruples of the north. John Mill, it is said, would have been a good Christian if he were not a great philosopher. Most white men would have been good Christians if they were not advanced civilized men. It is western civilization that has turned Christianity out of the west. But where the interests of civiliaztion do not collide with those of Christianity the white man appears as a good Christian. Civilization is the first charge on his psychological possessions. This is how the south appears so dark, and the north so bright. It may be argued that this weakness or strength, call it by whatever name, is common to all civilizations so far known to men. The Greeks and the Romans would have behaved like the modern Europeans under similar circumstances. This last point is irrelevant, because western civilization owes its characteristic features to Greek and Roman civilization. As regards other civilizations it may be remarked that the difference between them and western civilization owes its origin to the greater virility which the latter possesses. But the differences of quantity once setting in, in a complex psychological mass, soon produces differences of quality, specially when certain elements receive more heat and stirring than other elements. Love of self and hate of neighbour have both received the maximum of caloric influence and medical stirring in western civilization and these form the foundation of ethics personal, communal and national. So far as personal ethics is concerned there are men in the west who can challenge anybody in the world for goodness of conduct. But conduct in an advanced civilization is largely divorced from character, from the inner psychology of the soul. Camouflage, by reiteration, becomes converted into sincere conviction. The northern states, in their war with the south, began with rank camouflage, and ended with firm conviction. Naked sincerity can have no place in civilization. If the world wishes to be openly and unreservedly

sincere it must give up civilization, to say nothing of western civilization. Civilization without hyprocrisy is a baloon without hydrogen. Western civilization would be smashed in a month if the confessor were truly served. The ritual of the confession is a farce in catholicism leavened by western civilization.

There is another difference. What is regarded as abberration of conduct in other civilizations is considered as normal in western civilization. This idea of the norm is being gradually reinforced by the culture of western civilization. That culture is pragmatic in essence and is invigorated by the theory of natural selecction, which implies struggle for existence, and which latter in its turn, implies competition, jealousy and hate for neighbour. Men never fight out of mutual love. They fight because they hate each other. If the fighting begins with a small amount of hate, the hate is invigorated afterwards by the belligerents calling each other names. Warriors in primitive time as they went on fighting and shooting arrows loudly abused their adversaries. In modern times this is done through press, platform and pulpit. In the last war polite literature was dropped from aeroplanes to madden the enemy. Probably in the next war wireless apparatus will be used for pushing mustard seeds into the enemy's ears. Hate lies in the beginning, it lies in the end, it pervades war throughout. Now no civilization has been free from hate. In other civilizations hate is regarded as a moral abberration, western civilization supports hate by the theory of civilization and thus fixes its normalcy. It makes the theory of life conform to the common practice of life, and bestows normative value on it.

Darwinism can never agree with a weak race. It would lead to decadance and annihilation by the extinction of hope and a sickening diffusion of fear : hence, though it is sometimes attempted to be driven into the culture of subject races, it cannot long thrive there. Darwinism will never thrive in India. It can thrive only among the virile nations and it is doing so there at present. But hate is becoming normal even in India. Chaos is staring at the face of this wretched country.

The civil War which ended by abolishing slavery in the United States was not launched upon exactly on that issue. It was immediately caused by the attempt made by the South to secede from the North. The north had a majority in the congress. The result

of the war proved the true justification for representative government, which is based upon majority of votes directly; and upon superior muscular power (war-power, in all its aspects, including arms, ammunitions, intelligence, military trading, etc.) indirectly. If the majority were found to be weak in war-power, representative government would cease to command respect. Monarchy fell in France because the royal war-power, once the mightiest in the world, proved to be extremely weak. In the same way fell other monarchies. The justification for democratic rule resides in the fact that the ruling party is physically the strongest party. The southern states made the experiment in order to see whether the United States were ruled by a genuine or a counterfeit majority, obtained by the power of elocution and camouflage. The civil war has strengthened democracy as a principle of government all over the world. And most states are now democratic. The southern states have profited by the experiment, and they are thriving more amply with free negro labour than they ever did with slave labour. If they knew the secret that distinguishes free from slave labour there might have been no civil war and no bloodshed. The British people discovered this secret and gained by the abolition of slavery in their colonies. The colonies were close to the southern states and it is wonderful the latter failed to understand the secret though a quarter of a century had passed since slavery had been abolished in the colonies. In the protracted dispute over the slavery question extending over a number of years none of the advocates of abolition tried to convince the planters of the south that they would gain and not lose, by the abolition. Each party having taken a definite position refused to withdraw from it. This looks like sheer obstinacy, but it proves the worth of western culture and keeps the dogma of Darwinism intact. Without this combative spirit, ever trying to decide whether you or I am fit to survive, western civilization would cease to be what it is. It would lose its vigour, virility, and vertebrateness, its ascendency and chauvinistic pride. It would lose all that makes it so glorious.

It is curious that the civil war did not arise out of the issue whether slavery should be abolished. The question before the congress was whether slavery could be extended to new states. The issue was comparatively unimportant. Yet the southern states did not yield. I have already explained why they did not.

I think it is permissible to conclude that slavery in the northern states of America as well as in the British colonies was abolished because slavery was less profitable than free labour and because free labour was available. In the southern states slavery was abolished by the vigour and doggedness of western civilization more than by economic conviction.

It might be misleading not to mention that though the issue on which the civil war was fought was not, whether slavery should be abolished yet the southern states felt, and rightly felt that if they yielded slavery could not survive long. This ultimate issue formed the principle burden in the controversy that raged for many years between the advocates on the two sides. The smaller issue though it was chosen, lawyer like, by the abolitionists, their leader, Abraham Lincoln continually insisted that the constitution did not intend to continue slavery indefinitely and his arguments were for the most part directed towards abolition and not merely to the prevention of the expansion of slavery. To have dragged in the question of profit and loss, would have weakened the abolitionist position. The superiority of free labour is not an absolute fact. It depends upon circumstances, and the analogy between the British colonies and the southern states was open to controversy. The southern states felt that they could not expect free white labour, like the north, imported from Europe. They also felt that part of the emancipated black labour might seek work outside their accustomed limits. Perhaps they were most influenced by the idea that the slave population which multiplies by slave breeding would lose its principal creative factor by emancipation. Figures go to show that they were right. The present negro population is said to be about seven millions. The population of 1909, as given by Lord Bryce in his *American Commonwealth* was about eight millions. The slave breeders' interest was keener and deeper than the interest of wedlock. The incentive was stronger, industry cried for more men, and western civilization was not likely to fall short of its duty. The emancipated slavemen on the other hand probably entered into wedlock with meticulousness, for to him increasing population meant increasing misery, while to the breeder increasing population was a triumph, biologically as well as economically. It is possible the advocates of slavery foresaw this result. Lord Bryce has declined to compare the present prosperity of the south with its prosperity in the prewar period, though he finds that prosperity has been

increasing since the close of the war. White labour is coming in under the preasure of the Dismal Devil's glare in Europe and in the Northern states. Besides white labour was formerly deterred not merely by the climate of the south, but more forcibly by its disinclination to work side by side with slave labour.

The south considered the growth of the mixed breed of black Europeans or white negroes an economic necessity, while the north considered it a political anomaly. Here was the point where the two sides seriously lost contact. The civil war was thus a contest between economics and politics. The south stuck to economic advantage out of self-love, the north dreaded political danger out of hatred for neighbour. Thus both self-love and hatred for neighbour played their part in the War.

The mixed population is not only not increasing but it is gradually relapsing into deeper darkness as the white element as a factor is absent in reproduction. It is difficult to say whether humanity on the whole would have lost or gained by slave-breeding in the long run, apart from the interests of the north or the south of the American states, if it continued indefinitely.

THE TRAGEDY OF TRADE DEPRESSION.

The most conspicuous fact in the present condition of the world is that it is morose, melancholy, moping ; and the most insistent question that demands an answer is, what has made her so ? The irrefutable answer is, Trade-depression. The philistine asks, how does such a small event cause such a stupendous effect ? The man of culture answers, No, Trade is not a small thing ; it is synonymous with industry ; and industry is what makes life worth living in the modern age. The present civilization of the world is most appropriately called Industrial civilization. Trade-depression means depression of industry, of deligence, of exploitation, of the standard of life, of the worth of life, of life itself. It means lassitude, weariness, senility and fear of approaching disaster, possibly of death. It means unemployment, forced idleness, reduced profits, interests,

landvalue, value of shares in jointstock business, dividends, wages, salaries, incomes, fees, perquisites, commissions, insurance premiums, and all that conduce to high life, long life, security of life, self confidence, optimism, cheerfulness taste for amusements, spirit of adventure, speculative enthusiasm, courage, truthfulness, fearlessness, righteousness, sweetness and light. In short Trade-depression detracts from the value of life, makes it precarious, deprives it of joy, and creates a tendency to political agitation, social disruption, general degeneration, to homicide, suicide, infanticide, contraception, prostitution, vicarious pollution, depopulation and brutification. It decreases love, charity and sympathy ; and increases hate, jealousy, malice, spite. These are some of the ways in which Trade-depression shows itself. No, Trade-depression is no small matter. Its influence extends far beyond what concerns shopkeepers, grocers, tailors, hucksters, retail dealers, swindlers and smugglers. It affects the world and humanity as a whole, and may upset society, civilization and all that is dear to man.

There are several types of civilization, and each type is an art. One art differs from another in utility, beauty, ideality and stability. Industrial civilization is an art of life, and life includes thought, speech and action. World Trade-depression means that industrial civilization is in a parlous condition. It is passing through a crisis. What will happen if the crisis proves fatal ? Man will either return to the state of nature or adopt a new art of life, a new civilization. In the second case he will think, speak and act in a different way, but before doing so he will probably be turned into a bipedal beast, and left to shift for himself dependent on cosmic energy alone. Any way the present situation is disquieting. Man is distraught ; he is expecting or suspecting a catastrophe. He has lost self confidence. He thinks, speaks and acts with diffidence, despondence, sometimes with desperate foolhardiness. Philosophers think, politicians speak, and men of practical business act. They think erroneously, speak insincerly and act foolishly. Thought is devorced from forethought, speech from truthfulness and action from wisdom. The world is sinking from confusion to quagmire, and from quagmire to quandary.

Is the darkness of despondence equally distributed over all parts of society, over every part of the world ? No, the gloom is heaviest where industrial civilization has lived longest and proved most

successful. The whiteman is gloomier than the coloured man. The rich man is gloomier than the poorman. Man is gloomier than woman. The exploiter is gloomier than the exploited. Collective personalities are gloomier than individuals. The ruling classes are gloomier than the subjects. The great powers are gloomier than the small nations. Owners of vested interests are gloomier than those who depend upon natural rights only.

Nemesis, the dispenser of retributive justice has come to set things right. She has reversed the order of exploitation. The exploited has begun to exploit the exploiter, by active opposition or by passive resistance ; by positive and violent retaliation or by negative and non-violent non-co-operation. Labour exploits capital. Woman exploits man. The coloured man boycotts the white man. Gandhism is not a thing by itself. It is part and parcel with the general programme initiated by Nemesis. Critics of the present situation who try to distinguish between the Indian boycott and the world depression of trade are sadly mistaken.

Nemesis is using the exploited people as agents, instruments to bring repentance into the hearts of their exploiters. At the same time she is testing the loyalty and worth of the former by causing them additional suffering. They bear it patiently, and sacrifice themselves willingly and wittingly, courageously and manfully. The exploiters, the holders of vested interests tempt them and try to dissuade them by laying emphasis on their sufferings, by reproaching them for spitefulness and by offering them palliatives, deceptive advantages, and by trying to prove that in the long run they will be utterly ruined. Their hearts reply in silence that human rationality cannot stand before divine retribution, and that for them it is better to rely on Nemesis than on their tantalizing exploiters. They are committed to the service of Nemesis, the service of God, at whose command Nemesis organises the forces of retributive justice, which is not a mere name, but a stern reality which enabled Lord Balfour to hold a firm faith in God in fighting rationalism (Foundations of Belief).

Nemesis is not solely relying upon the co-operation of workers women, worn out spirits and weak races. She has called up Juvenile blood among the white races to harass the holders of vested interests, who are declining in defensive strength by long continued indulgence in the good things of lifs. She is setting up young

grizzlies against old grizzlies and creating an ineffable trimult of accusation and recrimination, diplomacy and counter-diplomacy, a confused jumble of tariff war, revenue tariff, preferential treatment, imperial preference, hypocrisy, camouflage, friendly rivalry, hostile co-operation, diabolical suspicion, devilish circumspection, truculent circumvention, political cartels, treacherous trusts, league of nations and perilous potentialities. There have thus been set up tremendous forces of jealousy, antipathy, malignity, spitefulness, inspired by the will-to-power and primacy.

Economists speak of falling prices, depletion and secretion and non-monetary use of gold, of debauchment of currency and other erudite economic nonsense, as the real causes of the tragedy of the present day. But these touch merely the outer fringe of the phenomenon of trade-depression. The real cause lies deeper. Socialism, feminism, democracy and self-determination must now have a fair trial, and it may be easily guessed that the running century will be one of disaster.

Dr. Rabindra Nath Tagore probably anticipated the present catastrophe and the advent of Nemesis when he wrote his essays on '*Nationalism.*' *People laughed at him at the time* as a man who had failed to free himself from the fetters of superstition. But he now looks like a Prophet, a real Seer.

Leaving aside Nemesis or supernature of any other kind as superstious, has science been able to discover any adequate rational cause or causes of the depression? Depletion of gold may reduce prices, and it is probable that the ratio between the total quantity of gold and the total quantity of commodities sicking consumption is different to-day from the ratio which obtained a year ago. But is there any evidence that the ratio is changing from month to month? There is no evidence that gold is decreassing while production, as a whole, is increasing. On the other hand increasing unemployment unmistakeably shows that production is decreasing, as a whole. If both gold and real wealth are decreasing, is there any evidence that gold is decreasing faster than the latter? What is becoming of the gold that is disappearing? It is said France and America have withdrawn a large quantity of gold from circulation as money. What have they done with the gold thus withdrawn? These countries are not immune from the

general depression. America is suffering most from unemployment with her eight millions of men seeking for employment. France also has her tale of unemployment, of bank failures, of the closing down of businesses: why then do these countries not return to good sense and set free the abstracted gold for circulation as money? If instead of setting it free, they are absorbing an increasing quantity of gold, what is the object? Western Civilization has seldom suffered from intellectual deficiency and there is no evidence that it is suffering from its now. The cause lies in moral depravity—selfishness supplemented by spitefulness. It is probable America and France find that by setting the abstracted gold free, they would bring more relief to rival countries than to themselves. They are probably afraid that they would lose their primacy among the nations. Western Civilization has never taken a cosmopolitan view of social phenomena. Nationalism, as pointed out by Dr. Tagore, has made it blind to the sufferings of humanity as a whole. It has never thought of improving the world as a whole. An exploiting civilization is incapable of doing that. Western Civilization would begin to decay if it relaxed its spitefulness. All nations following the principles of Western Civilization would act like America and France under similar circumstances. Hence there is no question of compelling or even of requesting these two countries to bethink themselves of the injury they are inflicting on the world at large.

The truth is that it is not the abstraction of gold, but the loss of credit and mutual trust that has caused the depression and that the growing loss of credit and increasing mistrust is increasing the depth and expansion of the depression—Mr. Baldwin has tersely expressed the psychology of the white man by the words "diabolical suspicion." Credit has been lost because its advantages have been reaped in different degrees by the several nations. Paper currency has different backings of gold in different Countries. There was no international arrangment to prevent this, and there is no international organization capable of rehabilitating equitibrium of credit. Indeed there is no desire to rehabilitate it. Other nations chackle while some nations sink below their depth. This psychology of jealousy and spitifulness must cease before the civilized world can rise again. The growth of nationalism is the primary cause of

growing depression of trade, Nationalism has been for a long time backed by exploitation of what are called the weak races. The weak Races are showing strength and the exploiting races are suffering. The principle of self-determination has demoralised all the nations, and weakened western civilization.

'Until the civilized nations cease to think nationalistically, and seriously begin to think humanistically no substantial relief can be expected.' But western civilization will cease to be western civilization if they do so, and in their eye the word 'western' has more value than the word 'civilization' in 'Western Civilization'.